Ex libris R. Daniel

THE CASE STATED

between the

CHURCH of ROME

and the

CHURCH of ENGLAND

in a

SECOND CONVERSATION

betwixt a

ROMAN CATHOLICK LORD,

and a

GENTLEMAN of the CHURCH of *ENGLAND*.

The SECOND PART.

Be ready always to give an Answer to every Man, that asketh you a Reason of the Hope, that is in you.
1. Pet. 3. ℣. 15.

Printed Anno 1721.

37
9
40

THE SECOND CONVERSATION BETWIXT A ROMAN CATHOLICK LORD, AND A GENTLEMAN OF THE CHURCH of ENGLAND CONTINUED.

§. 1.

Of the Virtue, and Efficacy of the Sacraments.

Lord. SIR, as we were last Time upon the Point of Parting, you were pleased to tell me, that *France remains still in the Dreggs of the Corruptions of Rome*; and amongst those *Dreggs* you reckon'd *Confession* for one. Well, Sr, if *Confessing* our Sins be among the *Dreggs of Corruption*, I must own the *Reformation* has effectually

purged your *Church* of it: And the *Drudgery* of *Satisfaction*, which according to *Proteſtant* Doctrine is Derogating from the *infinite Satisfaction* of *Chriſt*, is purged away with it.

Bleſſed *Reformation!* Which has deliver'd her Children from the *Popiſh Yoke* of *Confeſſing their Sins*, and *Doing Penance for them!* 'Tis true, this was the *Old Way* of Going to Heaven after the Loſs of *Baptiſmal Grace*. For which End the *Solemn Faſt* of *Lent*, beſides double the Number of other Faſting Days were commanded by the *Church*, and innumerable *Religious Houſes* were ſet up to ſerve as *Sanctuaries* for *Repenting Sinners*. But who would have cared one Farthing for the *Reformation*, if this *Old Way* had been kept up? 'Twas therefore wiſely done to remove theſe Obſtacles to that *Godly Work* by perſwading the People, that *Confeſſing* and *Punishing* their Sins, as *Papiſts* do, are but unneceſſary Ceremonies, and that the Way to Heaven is both *eaſier* and *ſafer* without them. However I have heard you ſay ſometimes, that *Confeſſion* is a good Thing, if rightly uſed.

» *G.* And I ſay ſo ſtill: but not in that Senſe, it » is generally uſed with you, and is expreſs'd in » your *Catechiſm ad Parochos de Pœnitentiæ Sacramento*, » Sect. 46. 47. That ſuch a *Repentance*, as God will » not accept nor pardon for it, is made ſufficient » by the *Sacrament of Penance*, and all our Sins re- » mitted by it: and that *pauciſſimi*, very few can be » ſaved without it; they might have ſaid, *None*. For » they here require in Repentance acceptable to » God a Senſe and Sorrow for Sin, that ſhall be *fully* » *equal* to the Demerit, *ut cum ſceleruni magnitudine* » *æquari conferrique poſſit*; which is impoſſible for » Mortal Man: And therefore all muſt be damn'd » without the *Sacrament of Penance*. pag. 109.

L. I fear, Sr, there are but few ſaved without it; nay moſt certainly none of thoſe, who are *willfully* out of the *Pale* of the *Catholick Church*; becauſe the *Repentance* of ſuch can never be *ſincere*. However, to come to the Words of the *Catechiſm*, tho you have quoted them fairly, you have tranſlated them very unfairly. For the Word *conferri* (which you have omitted in your Tranſlation) *mollifies* and *explains* the Word *æquari*; and ſhews it to import not a *full Equality*, as you have render'd it in *English*, but an *Equality* of *Proportion*. So that the Meaning of the *Catechiſm* is no other, than that our Sorrow muſt be ſuch, that it may be *compared with*, and *bear a Proportion* to the Grievouſneſs of our Sins; which is not impoſſible by the Help of God's Grace.

'Tis likewiſe true what the *Catechiſm* ſays, that there is a *twofold Contrition*, or Repentance: One ſo *perfect*, that is ſuffices to obtain the full Pardon of our Sins without the *Sacrament of Penance*; tho it always implies a *ſincere Deſire* of it: But whether there be *few* or *many*, that have this *perfect Contrition* is all a *Gueſs*, and known to God alone. But there is another *Contrition*, or Repentance of a more *imperfect Nature*, yet it is *hearty* and *ſincere* not only as to it's *Deteſtation* of *paſt Sins*, but likewiſe as to it's *Purpoſe* of *Amendment* for the Time to come. This the *Catechiſm* ſays is inſufficient to blot out Sins without the *Sacrament*; yet is a ſufficient *Preparation* to it. Nor do I ſee any Thing you can reaſonably object againſt it.

G. My Lord, the *Catechiſm* ſays, it was neceſſary that God ſhould inſtitute this Sacrament as an *eaſier Way* for Men to get to Heaven.

L. Pray, Sr, can any *Chriſtian* doubt, but that *Chriſt* has inſtituted the *Sacraments* as *Means* to *facilitate* our Way to Heaven?

» *G.* My Lord, you interrupted me: the Words » of the *Catechiſm* are there. *Quare neceſſe fuit, ut cle-* » *mentiſſimus Dominus faciliori ratione communi hominum* » *ſaluti conſuleret.* An eaſy Way indeed! *Confeſs* to » a Prieſt, and get *Abſolution*, and this makes up » the *Defects* of your *Repentance*, and you are ſaved » *ex opere operato*, by the Work wrought, the bare » Performance of this *Sacrament*. And the *Council* » of *Trent* anathematizes all thoſe, who ſay, that » the very *Sacraments* of the Goſpel do not conferr » *Grace* in the ſame Manner by the bare Perfor- » mance. *Si quis dixerit per ipſa novæ legis Sacramenta ex* » *opere operato non conferri Gratiam ----- Anathema ſit.* » Seſſ. 7. Can. 8. It is true, that God did inſtitute » his *Sacraments* as *Means of Grace* (for which we » bleſs his Name daily in our general Thankſgiving) » but this turns them into *Charms*, when the *very* » *Sacraments* themſelves, *ipſa Sacramenta*, conferr » the Grace *ex opere operato*, by the bare Perfor- » mance of the Work. *pag.* 110.

L. Sr, I heartily ſubſcribe to the *Definition* of the *Council* of *Trent*, and join with it in Pronoun- cing *Anathema* againſt all that deny it. But, Sr, you are not quite ſo much out of the Way as you will needs appear to be. For you grant the *Thing*, and only quarrel with the *Expreſſion*, to have the malig- nant Pleaſure of Lampooning *Popery*.

You ſay, 'tis true, that God did inſtitute his *Sa- craments* as *Means of Grace*: we ſay the ſame. Becauſe Almighty God, who can make us become Partakers of his *holy Grace* by what *Means* he pleaſes, has thought fit to inſtitute certain *outward* and *vi- ſible Signs*, which we call *Sacraments*, to ſerve as *Means* to convey it to us. And becauſe they do this *independently* of the *Holineſs*, the *Merits*, or *Faith* of the *Miniſter*, they are ſaid to *conferr Grace ex*

opere operato, that is, by that *Virtue* or *Efficacy*, which *Chriſt* gave them in their *Inſtitution*. And if you will needs call this a *Charm*, you are free to pleaſe yourſelf with the *prophane Fancy*. But if you will ſtand to it in good earneſt, I ſhall make you ſenſible, that you beſpatter yourſelf with the Dirt you throw at us. Pray, Sr, is not *Baptiſm* a *Sacrament*?

G. Who doubts it?

L. Well, Sr, let us ſuppoſe the *Miniſter*, who *baptizes* a *Child* to be an *Heretick*, or a *wicked Man*, will not the *Baptiſm* be *valid*, and the Child receive the *full Grace* of the *Sacrament*?

G. I cannot deny but he will.

L. I know you cannot deny it, unleſs you will renounce your 26th *Article of Religion*. But here, Sr, you are trapann'd into the *opus operatum* of the *Council* of *Trent*, which you nickname a *Charm*. For the *Miniſter* being ſuppoſed to be an *Heretick*, or a *wicked Man*, and the Child being *void of Reaſon*, the *Baptiſmal Grace* he receives muſt be attributed wholly and ſolely to the *Virtue* and *Efficacy* of the *Sacrament*. So that *the Sacrament itſelf conferr's Grace by the bare Performance of the Work according to Chriſt's Inſtitution*: that is, *independently* either of the *Holineſs* of the *Miniſter*, or *Cooperation* of the *Child*: And if you call this *Turning it into a Charm*, 'tis a *Charm* of *Divine Inſtitution*, and I hope both *Prieſts* and *Parſons* may make Uſe of it without Danger of becoming *Conjurers* or *Magicians* by it.

G. Then I preſume, My Lord, you require no more *Preparation* for the *Sacrament of Penance*, than a *Child* is capable of for the *Sacrament of Baptiſm*: that is to ſay, none at all.

L. Sr, you cannot be ſuch a Stranger to our Doctrine as to think ſo. We require a *diligent Exa-*

mination of *Conſcience*, a *ſincere Repentance*, and an *humble Confeſſion*. And therefore your *Comment* upon the *Catechiſm*; viz. *that we need but confeſs, and get Abſolution, and we are ſaved by the bare Performance of the Sacrament*, is a rank Calumny, and you know it to be one; becauſe you cannot but know that all our printed *Catechiſms*, and *Books* of *Inſtruction* to prepare People for the *Sacrament of Penance*, tell them poſitively, that to receive a *profitable* and *valid Abſolution*, they muſt have a *true Sorrow* for their Sins, and a *ſincere Purpoſe* not only to abſtain for the future from *Sin*, but the very *Occaſions* of it. And is this *barely Confeſſing, and Getting Abſolution*, as you have both falſely and maliciouſly repreſented the Matter?

G. But, if the *Preparation* you ſpeak of be really required, pray, My Lord, what becomes then of the Doctrine of *opus operatum*?

L. Sr, the Doctrine of *opus operatum* is in no Danger of being prejudiced by it; becauſe as *Original Sin* is remitted by the very *Virtue* and *Efficacy* of the *Sacrament* of *Baptiſm*, ſo are *actual Sins* remitted by the very *Virtue* and *Efficacy* of the *Sacrament* of *Penance*: But with this Difference, that a Child can put no *Obſtacle* to the *Grace* of *Baptiſm*; whereas the *Efficacy* of the *Sacrament of Penance* is certainly obſtructed by *Impenitence*: And therefore a *ſincere Repentance*, and *Purpoſe of Amendment* are *Conditions* indiſpenſably requiſit to qualify a Sinner for the *Benefit* of *Abſolution*, which is the *peculiar Grace* of that *Sacrament*. But it do's not produce *this Grace* but in Souls *worthily diſpoſed*, that is, in Souls, which bring no *poſitive Obſtacle* to it; and in theſe it infallibly produces it, whether it be adminiſter'd by a *Saint*, or a *Reprobate*: which is the true, and a clear Explication of the Doctrine of *opus operatum*. But they

are

are *Popish* Words; and therefore tho their true Meaning cannot be disputed, they must be condemn'd and ridiculed by a *true Son* of the *Church of England*.

G. My Lord, let us exemplify this Matter by « the Use made of the *Institutions* of God under the « *Law*. The *Jews* had got a Notion of the *opus ope-* « *ratum*, that the *bare Performance* of the *Letter* of « the *Law* in their *Sacrifices*, *Feasts*, *Fasts*, and other « *Observances*, was all that was required of them. « *pag.* 110. «

L. Had they so, Sr! Then they had got a very wrong Notion.

G. Whence the Voices of all the *Prophets* were « against these *Institutions*. They call them *Iniquity*, « *Abomination*, and *hateful to God*. pag. 110. 111. «

L. What, Sr, was the *Voice* of the *Prophets* against the *Institutions themselves!* I presume you mean the *Abuses* of them. Pray, Sr, explain yourself.

G. Nay God denies that he did require them, « or ever institute them; that is, as a *dead Carcass* « without a Soul, and Working like *Charms* by the « bare *opus operatum*. God did never institute such, « nor require them at our Hands. *pag.* 111. «

L. Very right, Sr, God never ordain'd his *holy Rites* or *Sacrifices* with an Intention, that they should be *prophaned*, or made Use of as *Magical Charms*; but that himself should be honour'd and worshipp'd by them. What then?

G. And may we not say, no more under the « *Gospel* than the *Law*? For the *Gospel* introduced a « more *pure* and *spiritual Worship*. But the *Council of* « *Trent* by Naming *only* the *Sacraments* of the *new* « *Law* applies the *opus operatum* to them also, if not « chiefly. *pag.* 111. «

L. You should say to the *Sacraments only*. For they alone confer Grace *ex opere operato*. But I perceive those terrible Words have frighten'd you both out of good *Sense*, and *Good Manners*. For otherwise you would not make this ridiculous *Parallel* between the *Jews* and *us*, viz. that as the *Jews* placed their Hopes of Salvation in the *bare Performance* of the *ceremonial Law*, tho their Lives were most wicked, so *Roman Catholicks* do the same with Relation to the *Sacraments* of the *New Law*. This, Sr, is the Charitable Drift of your Discourse: tho there be not a *Catechism*, or *Book of Instruction* for Receiving the *Sacraments*, but detects the Foulness of the Aspersion, by Declaring positively, that the *Abuse* of the *Sacraments* is a most *grievous Sin*, and that the *unworthy Receiver* gets nothing but *Damnation* to himself by it. But let me tell you, Sr, that *Lampooning* the *Sacraments*, and *Rejecting* the greatest Part of them is a Sin of as black a Die, as to receive them *unworthily*.

§. 2.

Of Beads.

G. MY Lord, 'tis plain, that your Doctrine of *opus operatum* runs through all your *Devotions*. » What else is the Meaning of Tying Men » up to the Repetition of such a precise Number » of *Ave's*, *Pater's* and *Creeds* at such particular » Times, *whether the Mind go along with them or not?* » For you will see People in the Markets Buying » and Selling, or Discoursing of common Business, » and Dropping their *Beads* all the while, to keep » Count, if they have rightly perform'd their Task » of the *opus operatum*. pag. 111.

L. This *opus operatum* ſticks ſtrangely on your Stomach; yet you know not what to do without it in the *Sacrament* of *Baptiſm*, as I have plainly ſhew'd.

As to what you tell me, *that we tye Men up to the Repetition of ſuch a preciſe Number of Ave's, and Pater's, and Creeds at ſuch particular Times*; I know of no ſuch Obligation laid upon any by the Church: for the Beads are a Devotion principally deſign'd for thoſe, who cannot read, and every one is free to uſe or not uſe it juſt as he pleaſes. However I can ſee no Harm in Repeating the ſame Prayer often over *provided the Mind go along with it.* But this, you ſay, is not required. Pray, Sr, be pleaſed to read our Books of Inſtruction concerning the *Duty of Prayer*, and they will inform you better. But at the ſame Time look over the *Table of Sins*, and you will find the Sin of *Slander* amongſt them.

What you add, viz. *that we may ſee People in the Markets Buying and Selling, or Diſcourſing of common Buſineſs, and Dropping their Beads all the while*, will not clear you from the Guilt of Slander. *Firſt*, becauſe the People do not always as they are taught. And *2dly*, becauſe People that attend the Markets, have many broken Intervals of Time, which they may employ very piouſly in Repeating ſome ſhort Prayers. I hope at leaſt you will own that even in the greateſt Hurry of Buſineſs *Dropping* of *Beads* is better than *Dropping* of *Oaths* and *Curſes*; which is but too much practiſed both in Shops and Markets on this Side of the Seas. But if I ſhould inſinuate, that this is done by *Principle* and the *Doctrine* of your *Church*, would you not poſt me up for a *Lyar?*

§. 3.

Of Bleſſings, and Conſecrations.

» *G.* BUt, My Lord, if *Prayers* and *Sacraments* » which are *Means* of *Grace* of God's own » *Inſtitution* may be abuſed, and render'd hateful to » God, what ſhall we ſay of thoſe *Means* of *Grace*, » which are of *Man's meer Invention?* pag. 111.

L. Sr, if you ſpeak of *Means of Grace* ſtrictly taken, ſuch as the Sacraments, I am wholly ignorant of any, that are of *Man's meer Invention.*

» *G.* None can appoint the *Means* but he, who » has the Beſtowing of the *End* to be obtain'd by » thoſe *Means.* As, if I have a thouſand Pounds to » beſtow, I may put what Conditions I think fit, » and appoint the *Means* for Obtaining it. Now » *Grace* is the Gift of the *Holy Ghoſt*, and none can » appoint the *Means* of Obtaining it, but who has » the Beſtowing of the *Holy Ghoſt*, which it is the » higheſt *Blaſphemy* for any Creature to aſſume to » himſelf. Hence *Chriſt's* ſending the *Holy Ghoſt* is a » ſure Proof of his *Divinity.* pag. 111. 112.

L. Sr, all this is very true, if you mean that *Chriſt alone* has the *Power* of *Inſtituting Sacraments.* For this is the expreſs Doctrine of our *Church.* But what do you inferr from it?

» *G.* My Lord, the *Church of Rome* takes upon » her to appoint *Means of Grace* many and various. » The *Pontifical* is made up of the *Forms* of *Conſe-* » *cration* of every Thing almoſt one can think of » into *means of Grace*, as *Bells*, *Books*, *Candles*, *Wa-* » *ter*, *Salt*, *Oil*, *Aſhes*, *Palms*, *Swords*, *Banners*, » and *Veſtments* of diverſe Sorts, even of *Children's* » *Clouts*; beſides *Croſſes*, *Pictures*, *Images*, *Agnus*

Dei's, &c. by the Uſe of which in the Manner « preſcribed ſeveral *Graces* both Ghoſtly and bodily « are ſaid to be obtain'd, as beſides the Favour of « God, and the Remiſſion of Sins, the Saving from « *Fire*, from *Diſeaſes*, from *Storms at Sea*, *Thunder*, « *Lightning*, and *Tempeſts at Land*; at which Time « they ring the conſecrated *Bells* to allay the *Winds*, « and chaſe away the *Damons* of the *Air*, who ſeeing « the *Sign of the Croſs* upon ſuch *Bells*, and Hearing « their Sound ſhall be *frighted* and *fly away*, as it is « expreſs'd in the *Form* of *Conſecration* of *Bells* in the « Pontifical. Nay there is nothing in the World ſo « inſignificant, a *Roſe* or a *Feather*, which the *Pope* « may not conſecrate into a *Means of Grace*, and is « in Uſe every Day. And at *Rome* they are counted « *Atheiſts*, who have not *Faith* in theſe Things, ſo « much they place their *Religion* in them. *pag.* 112. « 113. «

L. Before I give a direct Anſwer to this Piece, I make bold to ask, whether the *Diſſenters* will not object many Practices of the ſame Nature againſt your Church?

G. But without Ground. For we *conſecrate* no « *Creatures* ——— «

L. Sr, you forget yourſelf: But I ſhall refreſh your Memory immediately.

G. Nor do we attribute any *Virtue* Ghoſtly, or « bodily to the Uſe of them. They are uſed purely « for *Decency* and *Order*, and we may change them, « or take them quite away, as our Governours « think fit. pag. 113. «

L. So may the Governours of our Church, if they think fit, *Change* or *take away* the Practices, you are pleaſed to find Fault with. But for all that I fancy you would think that Man ſomewhat *Atheiſtically* inclined, who ſhould venture to *lampoon*,

and very *impertinent*, if he ſhould pretend to *reform* the *Rites* and *Ceremonies* of your Church; which perhaps appear as ridiculous to *Diſſenters*, as ſome of ours do to you.

» *G.* But can they ſhew any outward *Action* or » *Thing* appointed in *our Church*, by the Uſe of which » *Evil Spirits may be chaced away*, *Women* helpt in *La-* » *bour*, or *Storms* at Sea *quell'd*? ——

L. I really believe they cannot. The *evil Spirit* may *poſſeſs* as many good *Proteſtants* as he pleaſes, without being *moleſted* or *diſquieted* by any *Parſon* for it. They are all ſo juſt, as to give the *Devil* his due.

» *G.* But all theſe, and many more *Virtues* are » attributed in *your Church* to the Uſe of what they » call *Holy Water*, and many other ſuch like inſti- » tutions of Mechanical *Means of Grace*. pag. 113.

L. Sr, As for *Means of Grace ſtrictly taken*, I know no *ſuch Means* but the *Sacraments themſelves* inſtituted by *Chriſt*: Becauſe theſe alone by *Virtue* of their *Inſtitution* confer Grace *ex opere operato*, when no *willful Obſtacle* is put to it. But there are many more *Means of Grace*, if we take the Word in a *larger Senſe*. Thus *Praying*, *Faſting*, and *Giving Alms* are *Means* of *Grace*, becauſe they move God to beſtow his *Grace* upon us. Thus likewiſe *Hearing Sermons*, *Reading pious Books*, *Seeing Good Example*, or a *moving Picture* of our Saviour's Sufferings may in a *large Senſe* be call'd *Means of Grace*, becauſe they incite us to the Practice of *Virtues*, by which we obtain an *Encreaſe* of *Grace*: And if ſome *Debauché* ſhould ridicule theſe, and call them *Mechanical Means of Grace*, I believe you would have no great Opinion of his *Morals* for it.

But, Sr, you own yourſelf that *Prayer* is a *Means of Grace*. The *Sacraments* therefore are not the only

Means of Grace in the *large Senſe* I ſpeak of: for *Prayer* is no *Sacrament*.

G. But, My Lord, I told you at the ſame Time, that *Prayer* is a *Means* of *Grace* of God's own *Inſtitution*.

L. You did ſo, and 'tis very true, if you ſpeak of *Prayer* in *General*. But I know of no particular *Form* of *Prayer* but *one*, viz. the *Lords Prayer* expreſly commanded by *Chriſt*. The reſt are left to the *Prudence* and *Devotion* of the *Church*, which either orders them to be compoſed, or approves them, when compoſed by private Perſons. Now, Sr, all *Bleſſings*, *Hallowings*, *Conſecrations*, or call them what you pleaſe, are but ſo many *different Forms of Prayer* ordain'd by the *Church* to implore God's Bleſſing for ſuch or ſuch an End in the lawful *Uſe* of his *Creatures*; and if this be an *allowable*, nay a *Religious* Practice in ſome Things, as I ſhall preſently ſhew you muſt grant it is from the *Practice* of your own *Church*, I ſee no Reaſon, why it ſhould be ridiculed in others.

But firſt let us ſee, what Encouragement the *Practice* of the *Roman Catholick Church* in *Bleſſing inanimate* Things has from the *Word of God* itſelf. And here occurr's to me firſt the *ſolemn Dedication*, or *Conſecration* of the *Temple* of *Salomon*. And *Atheiſts* may call this Making a *Church* a *Mechanical Means of Grace*. But this Cuſtom of *Bleſſing*, and *Conſecrating* Churches (which I think are *inanimate Things* as well as *Bells*, *Books*, *Candles*, *&c.*) was the conſtant Practice of the *Catholick Church* even in her pureſt Times, as all Men of Learning know.

But what do you Think of the *Waters of Jealouſy*, by the due Uſe whereof *clandeſtine Adultery* was diſcover'd? *Numb.* 5. The *Shew-bread*, which is call'd *hallow'd* or *holy* Bread? 1. *Sam.* C. 21. V. 4. 6. The

Salt uſed by *Eliſha* for Sweetning the infected Waters of *Jerico*. 2 Book of Kings? C. 2. The *Liver* of the *Fiſh* taken by the *Angel Raphael* for Expelling the *Devil?* Lib. Tob. The *Clay* and *Waters of Siloam* uſed by *Chriſt* to open the Eyes of the Blindman? *Joh.* 9. ℣. 6. 7. And laſtly, the *Oil* uſed by the *Apoſtles* to cure the *Sick?* Mark. 6. ℣. 13.

Here are *Charms*, or *Mechanical Means of Grace*, as you call them, in Abundance authoriz'd by the Word of God itſelf. And St *Paul* has laid down a *Principle* of ſo large an Extent, that the frequent *Bleſſings* or *Conſecrations* uſed in the *Church of Rome* are fully juſtified by it. For he tell us expreſly, *that every Creature is ſanctified by the Word of God and Prayer.* 1. Tim. 4. ℣. 5. Now I preſume *Bells*, *Books*, *Candles*, *Water*, *Salt*, *Oil*, *&c.* are in the Number of *Creatures*: They may therefore be *ſanctified* (according to St *Paul*) by the *Word of God and Prayer*. And this anſwers every Thing you have ſaid, or can ſay againſt the *Bleſſings* or *Conſecrations* contain'd in the *Roman Pontifical*, tho they were twice as many in Number.

But is not the Daily Practice of your own *Church* in *Bleſſing* the *Meat* upon the Table as liable to *Buffoonery*, as any of the *Bleſſings* in the *Roman Pontifical?* For when the Parſon ſays *Grace* over a *Pig* or *Pudding* in theſe Words, *bleſs us, O Lord, and theſe thy Gifts, &c.* or, *Lord ſanctify theſe thy Gifts*; I ask, whether the *Pig*, or *Pudding* be *conſecrated* into a *Mechanical Means of Grace*, or not? If you ſay it is, you run into the *Abſurdity* you reproach us with. If not, what you object againſt us, is *frivolous*.

I likewiſe find the following Prayer in your Adminiſtration of *publick Baptiſm*. *Almighty and Everliving God, whoſe moſt dearly beloved Son ----- regard we beſeech thee the Supplications of thy Congregation.*

SANCTIFY

SANCTIFY THIS WATER *to the Myſtical Waſhing away of Sin, &c.* And the *Liturgy* in *Scotland* has it thus. SANCTIFY THIS FOUNTAIN *and Baptiſm, thou, which art the Sanctifyer of all Things.* If this be not a *Conſecration*, there is no ſuch Thing in the *Roman Pontifical.*

But the Ceremony of the King's *Coronation* is the moſt remarkable Piece of this kind of *Popery.* The Hiſtory of the *Coronation* of King *James* the 2d tells us *pag.* 91. in the Margin, that the OIL, with which he was anointed, was SOLEMNLY CONSECRATED on the Morning of the Coronation by the *Dean* of *Weſtminſter* aſſiſted by the *Prebendaries.* But *Baker* ſpecifies the very *Form* of *Bleſſing* the *Royal Ornaments* thus. *O God, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, by whom Kings do reign, vouchſafe we beſeech thee in thy Favour to* BLESS THIS KINGLY ORNAMENT. *Vouchſafe to* BLESS *and* SANCTIFY THIS SWORD, *which is hallowed for the Defence of thy holy Church. God, the Crown of the faithful,* BLESS AND SANCTIFY THIS CROWN, *ſo this thy Servant that weareth it, may be fill'd with thy manifold Graces. Bleſs O Lord, and ſanctify this Ring.* *Baker* printed *London* 1696. pag. 742. 743.

Here then we have *Meat, Water, Oil, Cloaths, Sword, Ring,* and *Crown bleſſed, hallowed, ſanctified,* and *conſecrated* according to the Practice of the *Church of England.* And what a Number of ridiculous Queſtions might here be ask'd, if a Man were but *Atheiſtically* enough diſpoſed to do it? But jeſting with *Religious* Matters is the very worſt Sort of *Buffoonery*; and all I have to ſay to the *Bleſſings* uſed in your *Church*, is, that you ought not to ridicule in us, what you practiſe yourſelves. The true Ground both of your Practice and ours is this; that whatever is *Good in itſelf*, may be lawfully *pray'd for in*

due Circumſtances: And as God's *Creatures* may be *abuſed*, ſo they may be *bleſs'd* to the End, that Men may uſe them as they ought. Thus *Images*, *Meats*, *Swords*, *Banners*, *Veſtiments*, and many other Things are *bleſs'd*: and none ought to find Fault with this but they, who either think that God cannot *bleſs* the moſt *indifferent* Things, or that *Prayer* is not a proper Means to obtain his *Bleſſing*.

However you are under a Miſtake, if you imagine that we place any *inherent Sanctity* in *inanimate* Things by their being *bleſs'd*. We only truſt, that whatever *Creatures* are *bleſs'd* by the *Church* in the Name of *Jeſus-Chriſt*, Almighty God will for his Sake render them beneficial to thoſe, who uſe them with Devotion in order to the End, for which they are ordain'd.

§. 4.

The Sign *of the* Croſs, Holy Water, *and* Exorciſms.

WHat you ſay concerning the *Sign* of the *Croſs* upon our *Bells* is no more a Matter of Jeſt, than the *Sign* of the *Croſs* in *Baptiſm*: for the one is of meer *human Inſtitution* as well as the other. But what an Age do we live in, when the *Sign* of the *ſacred Inſtrument* of *Man's Redemption* is made a Subject of Laughter amongſt *Chriſtians!* This was one of the earlieſt Fruits of the bleſſed *Reformation*. For then it was that a *Crucifix* began to be treated in this Iſland with the ſame Marks of *Ignominy* and *Contempt*, as if it were the *Image* of ſome *infamous Traitor*, or Enemy of the State. And even now a Man becomes as ridiculous in *Proteſtant* Company by *Bleſſing* himſelf with the *Sign* of the *Croſs*, as if he were dreſs'd up in a *Fools-coat*.

But was it ſo in the *primitive Ages*? Hear what *Tertullian* writes upon that Subject. *At every Step and every Turn; at every Coming in and Going out: if we put on our Cloaths, or change our Shoes; if we waſh, if we take a Repaſt, if a Candel be brought into the Room: if we lye, if we ſit, whatever we do, we are ſtill Making the Sign of the Croſs upon our Foreheads.* Lib. de corona militis. C. 3. And St *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* writes thus. *To this Day it* [the *Sign* of the *Croſs*] *cures Diſeaſes, chaces away Devils, and diſſolves Charms of Witchcraft and Art Magick.* Cat. 13. p. 138. Here you ſee the *Sign* of the *Croſs* not only *chaced* away *Demons*, but was a Remedy againſt *Diſeaſes*, and *Magicall Spells*. And why then may it not have ſome Part of this Effect by the *Benediction* and *Prayer* of the *Church*, when it is impreſs'd upon *Bells*, as well as any other Way?

But, to omit numberleſs other Teſtimonies of the Ancient Fathers relating to this Subject, how can you read the two Paſſages, I have quoted, without being convinced that in Deriding our preſent Practice you condemn that of the *pureſt Ages* of the *Church*? You tell me, *the Diſſenters can ſhew no outward Action, or Thing appointed in your Church, by the Uſe of Which Evil Spirits may be chaced away, Women help'd in Labour, of Storms at Sea quell'd.* A moſt wonderful Commendation! and you add immediately by Way of Reproach to us, *that all theſe, and many more Virtues are attributed in our Church to the Uſe of what we call* Holy Water, *and many other ſuch like Inſtitutions of Mechanical Means of Grace.*

Well, Sr, let us ſee, whether this *Mechaniſm* was not in *Uſe* amongſt the *Ancients*, and what *Effects* it wrought. It is above eleven hundred Years, ſince *Holy Water* began to be uſed in *England*. This appears from St *Gregory's* Epiſtle to St *Melitus*, to whom he wrote thus. *Let the Idols be deſtroy'd: Let*

HOLY WATER *be made; let it be ſprinkled in the ſaid Temples; let Altars be made, and Reliques placed in them:* Lib. 11. Epiſt. 76. This is an unanſwerable Proof, that the *Engliſh* received the *Uſe* of *Holy Water*, as likewiſe of *Reliques* together with their *Chriſtianity* from *Rome.* But it is ſtill far more ancient. For in the Reign of *Conſtantine*, the firſt Chriſtian Emperor, when the *Jews* by *Magical Enchantments* hinder'd the Building of a Church, we have in St *Epiphanius* this *Bleſſing* of *Water* uſed effectually againſt them by the holy Count *Joſeph*; who after he had made the *Sign* of the *Croſs* upon it pray'd thus. *In the Name of Jeſus of Nazareth ——— may this Water have Power againſt the Magical Charms and Enchantments, they* [the Jews] *have uſed; and may it reſtore to the Fire it's natural Force, that the Houſe of God may be finiſh'd.* Which Effect it had accordingly, and forced the *Jews* then preſent to confeſs the Power of *Chriſt.* Epiph. Hær. 30. §. 12. p. 136. 137.

I omit ſeveral other Relations of the like miraculous Effects wrought by the Uſe of Holy Water recorded in the Writings of the ancient Fathers. And I ſhall only add that the *Power* over *Devils* did not expire with the *Apoſtles*; nay that it was an *ordinary Power* of the *Catholick Church* in the third Age (tho it never was, nor ever will be in the *Reform'd Churches*) is evident from what St. *Cyprian* wrote Epiſt. 76. *To this very Day*, ſays he, *the Devil is ſcourg'd, and burnt, and tormented by the* EXORCISTS *with human Voice, and a Divine Power.* Now, Sr, you may laugh, or proceed to ſomething elſe, if you pleaſe.

§. 5.

Invocation of Saints.

G. MY Lord, that which makes up the Bulk « of the *Romish Devotions* is the *Worship* « and *Invocation* of *Saints* and *Angels*, the *Adoration* « of their *Images*, and the *Relicques of Saints* departed, « Pieces of their *Bodies*, or of their *Veſtments*, *&c.* « to which great *Miracles* are attributed: and there- « fore they are made *ſtrictly* and *properly Means of* « *Grace.* pag. 113. «

L. What, Sr, are all Things, to which *Miracles* are attributed, made *ſtrictly* and *properly Means of Grace*? Then they are by Conſequence made *Sacraments*; for theſe alone are *Means of Grace ſtrictly* and *properly* ſo call'd. So then the *Handkerchiefs* and *Aprons*, which touch'd St *Paul*, and by which *Diſeaſes were cured, and Evil Spirits chaced away.* Act. 19. ℣. 12. were (at leaſt whilſt he lived) ſo many more *Sacraments*, than ever were inſtituted by *Chriſt*. Nay it is writ, Act. 5. ℣. 15. *that they brought forth the Sick, and laid them on Beds and Couches, that at leaſt the Shadow of St* Peter *paſſing by might overſhadow ſome of them, and they might be deliver'd from their Diſtempers.* So that St *Peter's Shadow*, for ought we know, had as good a Title to be of the Number of *Sacraments*, as any of *Chriſt's* Inſtitution. How dangerous a Thing is it to be carried away with a *violent Prejudice*! For a Man's own *Principles* are generally *forgot*, and even common Senſe is loſt in the *Hurry*.

You tell me, *that the Bulk of the Romish Devotions is made up of the Worship and Invocation of Saints, and Angels, the Adoration of their Images, &c.* And I tell you, Sr, that the *Bulk* of *Proteſtant Objections* in

made up of *Misrepresentation* and *Slander*; For the *Bulk* of our Devotions, and indeed the only *essential Devotion* of every true Christian consists in the *Worship*, *Invocation*, and *Adoration* of *God through Jesus Christ*: And we hold it to be a damnable Impiety to give *God's Worship*, to any Creature whatsoever.

As to our *Invocation of Saints* (which is the Article, we have now chiefly before us) I shall set down the Doctrine of our *Church*, as it stands recorded in the *Council of Trent*; whose Definitions in this as well as other *Doctrinal* Points must surely be allow'd to be the true *Standard* of our Faith. What therefore the *Council* teaches is this. Viz. *That it is good and profitable for Christians humbly to invocate the Saints, and to have Recourse to their Prayers, Aid, and Assistance, whereby to obtain Benefits of God through his Son our Lord* Jesus-Christ, *who is our only Redeemer and Saviour.* Sess. 25.

These are the Words of the *Council*, wherein our Doctrine concerning the *Invocation* of *Saints* is fully and faithfully deliver'd: and the Sum of it is, *that it is good and profitable, and by Consequence lawful to desire the Saints in Heaven to pray for us.* Whence I inferr, that the Question between us if truly stated is this. Viz. *Whether it be not as lawful for Christians to desire the Saints in Heaven to pray for them, as it was for St* Paul *to desire the Christians upon the Earth to pray for him.* Rom. 15. ℣. 30. I confess I have not Penetration enough to see the *Lawfulness* of the one, and *Unlawfulness* of the other.

» *G.* My Lord, the Reason of the *Lawfulness* of » the one, and *Unlawfulness* of the other is, because » the one is *commanded*, the other *not*; nay *forbidden*, » as I will shew you. *pag.* 114.

L. Sr, I remember a good old Woman once made me this Answer, and I thought it was well

enough for her Capacity. But this I can assure you, that if you ever can bring me any tolerable Proof that we *obey God* in the *one*, and *disobey* him in the *other*, or that the *Lawfulness* of the *one* do's not manifestly infer the *Lawfulness* of the *other*, I shall freely own there is no such Thing as a *Contradiction* possible in the World.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Immediately after the Gentleman's *last Words in his* Case stated *his Lordship is made to say*, that is seems to be Giving greater Glory to God, and more Humility in us not to approach his Presence directly, and immediately ourselves. *Which is false Doctrine, if he means, that we* ought not *to pray directly and immediately to God through the* Mediation *of* Jesus-Christ. *Then his Lordship draws a Comparison from the difficult Access to earthly* Kings *to illustrate the Nonsense he has utter'd. The Case indeed is often such with* Kings upon Earth, *who cannot be approach'd by every Body, but never with the* King of Heaven, *to whom (through our Lord* Jesus-Christ) *we have free Access, as often as we please. But why then do we desire the* Saints in Heaven *to pray for us? I answer for the very same Reason, which moved Saint* Paul *to desire the Faithful upon Earth to pray for him. Viz.* That God may have the Honour, and we the Profit of more Prayers than our own. *Now let us hear the* Gentleman's *Answer to his* Lordship's *fore mention'd Words, and wise Similè.*

G. YOur *Similè* will hardly on all four. For God « is nearer to us than any *Saint* or *Angel*. *In* «

» *God we live and move, and have our Being.* But the » *Angels* and *Saints departed* are at a Diſtance from » us; and we know not where to find them, or that » they hear our Prayers; for they are not every » where; that is an *Attribute* of *God* Alone. *p.* 114.

L. Sr, God is alſo *nearer to us*, than we are to one another; yet this hinders us not from Deſiring one another's Prayers: And St *Paul* deſired the Prayers of thoſe, that were at a great Diſtance from him, tho he knew not whether his Petition would ever find them or not. However we know for certain that the *Saints* departed are in *Heaven*, where they ſee God *Face to Face*; and it is no idle Conjecture to ſay that by thus *ſeeing* him they know a great Deal more of us, than we know of them.

We likewiſe know for certain (and 'tis a Truth acknowledg'd by *your Church*, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter) that the *Saints* and *Angels*, who are the *Church Triumphant*, pray for the *Church Militant*, which is upon Earth. Whence it follows *firſt*, that our Deſiring a Part in their Prayers cannot be unprofitable, as long as we are ſure it is known to God, tho the *Saints* and *Angels* ſhould know Nothing of it. The Reaſon is, becauſe as it is an Article of our Belief, that all *Bleſſings* flow originally from *God alone* through *Jeſus-Chriſt*, ſo in the Deſires and Language of the Heart 'tis only to *God* through *Jeſus-Chriſt*, that all our Prayers are chiefly directed, without which they would not be *ſtrictly Prayers*. Whence it follows *2dly*, that it is the ſame in Effect, whether we ſay *Holy Peter pray for us*, or whether we pray thus, *O God grant us a ſhare in the Prayers of St Peter*. As it was the very ſame in *David* to ſay, *praiſe the Lord all ye Nations*, Pſalm 116. ℣. 1. as if he had ſaid, *O Lord, may all Nations praiſe thee*. And by Conſequence, tho it were true, that the *Saints* and *Angels*

Angels know Nothing of our *Invoking* them, 'tis enough, that it be known to God, when we desire them to pray for us, that is, to have a Part in the Fruit of their Prayers.

But, Sr, I only say this to let you see the Weakness of your Argument: for I am of another Judgment, and think we have no Reason to doubt but the *Saints* are acquainted with our Prayers.

Origine says expressly, that all the *Angels and blessed Souls befriend those, that serve God, and that they know who are in his Favour.* L. 8. contra Celsum. Edit. Huet. *pag.* 949.

This was also St *Gregory's* Opinion, who writes thus. *Because all the Saints see God, what is it they do not know there, where they know him who knows all Things?* L. 4. Dial. C. 33.

This was likewise the Judgment of St *Paulinus* Bishop of *Nola*, when he made his Country-man address himself thus to St *Felix* for his lost Cattle. *Tu scis ubi sunt, qui lumine Christi cuncta & operta vides, longeque absentia cernis.* That is, *Thou knowst where they are, who by the Light of Christ sees't all Things even that are hidden, and far distant from thee.*

St *Austin* was of the same Opinion, when he made this Apostrophe to St *Paul*. *You reign with Christ together with him, whom you stoned* [St *Stephen*] *you both now see us, you both hear this my Discourse. I desire you both to pray for us.* Serm. 316. ult. Edit. §. 5.

And St *Asterius* Bishop of *Amasea* in the 4th Age pray'd thus to the Martyrs. *You yourselves have formerly pray'd to the Martyrs before you were Martyrs. They heard you, when you entreated them. Now that you can hear us, grant us our Request.* Serm. 10.

Lastly, St *Basil* discourses thus upon the 40 Martyrs. *He who is oppressed with any Trouble has recourse to these: so has he, that is in joy: the one for a Delive-*

rance, the other for a Continuation of his State. Here a Mother is heard Praying for her Children, or the ſafe Return, or Health of her Husband ------ And there is not one of them, who do's not ſee all Things. Orat. 20. in 40. Martyres. Tom. 1. Edit. Par. ann. 1637. pag. 459. D.

What Pity is it, that the *Reformation* did not come above a thouſand Years ſooner to *reform* theſe *Popiſh Fathers!* Who made no Scruple to *invoke the Saints*, and exhort others to do the ſame: nor had they any Difficulty to believe, that as the *Prophets* could foreſee *future Events*, and ſee Things done at a *Diſtance* by the meer *Light of Grace*, ſo the *Saints* in *Heaven* may do the ſame by the *Light of Glory*. And 'tis this the *Schoolmen* call the *Speculum*, or *Looking-glaſs* of the *Saints*, wherein they ſee the Prayers and Neceſſities of thoſe, who implore their Aid in this World.

» *G.* Do they ſee every Thing in this *Looking-*
» *glaſs?* then they know as much as *God*. But if not,
» then how do we know they ſee our *Prayers* there?
» And how will this Sort with your *Similè* of an
» *Earthly King*, that the Courtier muſt go to the King
» to know what I deſired the Courtier to ask of him?
» *pag.* 114.

L. Sr, as to your *Similè*, I yield up to you the whole *Property* of it, and you may do with it what you pleaſe. But as to what you ſay, *that if the Saints ſee every Thing, they know as much as God*, your Conſequence is ſtark nought. For tho they ſhould know all Facts *paſt*, *preſent*, and *to come* (more than which cannot be meant by the Words *every Thing*, when we ſpeak of *Creatures*) their Knowledge would ſtill be *limited* as thoſe Things are: and, by Conſequence come *infinitly ſhort* of the *infinite Knowledge* of *God*, who not only knows all Things *paſt*, *preſent*, and *to come*, but every Thing, that is *poſſible*. But ſuppoſe

they do not know every Thing, then you ask *how we know, that they ſee our Prayers?* And I ask you, how you know, that they do not ſee them? For 'tis ridiculous, nay *Blaſphemous* to ſay, that God cannot communicate to his *Saints* the Knowledge of our Petitions either immediately by himſelf, or by the Miniſtry of our *Angels-Guardians*, who certainly know both our Neceſſities and Prayers.

G. Abraham is the Father of us all. Rom. 4. ℣. 16. « and *he was call'd the Friend of God.* Jam. 2. ℣. 23. « Therefore it is likely, that he ſaw as far into the « *Looking-glaſs* as another. Yet it is ſaid. *Iſa.* 63. ℣. 16. « *That Abraham is ignorant of us.* And are not we as « ignorant of their State, and what Knowledge they « have of us below? We are told, that they have « no Knowledge of it. *His Sons come to Honour, and « he knoweth it not, and they are brought low, but he per- « ceiveth it not of them.* Job. 14. ℣. 21. pag. 115. «

L. I am ſorry, Sr, I muſt accuſe you of a *Blunder*, For not only your good Friends the *Schoolmen*, but your own *Catechiſm* will tell you, that in the Days of *Iſaiah* and *Job* there were no *Saints* in Heaven, becauſe Mankind was not then redeem'd; and ſo your Jeſt of *Abraham's ſeeing as far as another into the Looking-glaſs of the Saints* is quite ſpoil'd. However the true Meaning of *Iſaiah* according to St *Jerom* is this, viz. *Neither* Abraham *nor* Jacob *will acknowledge thoſe to be his Children, whom they know to be wicked*, Hier. in Cap. 63. Iſa. in which Senſe our Saviour ſpeaks Math. 25. ℣. 12. *verily I ſay unto you, I know you not.*

As to the Text quoted from holy *Job*, St *Gregory* tells us, that he do's not ſpeak there of *Saints*, but of *ſenſual* and *Carnal* Men, that loved this *World*, and eſpecially their *Children* more than God. And theſe (according to St *Gregory*) are ſaid by holy

Job to be *ignorant* in the other World of what they loved inordinately in this. *Hoc beatus Job nescire eos postmodum asserit, quod hic vehementius amaverunt.* But, Sr, why should the *Saints* be kept in Ignorance of what passes in this World any more than the *Angels*, of whom it is said, *that they rejoice over a Sinner that repenteth?* For both are upon the same Foot, as *Protestants* themselves own.

» *G.* That is, when it pleaseth *God* to let them » know it, or that the *Sinner* comes thither. But » that they know of *every Penitent* upon Earth is no » where said; nor do I know it asserted by any. » *pag.* 115.

L. What wretched Shifts are you here put to, to answer this plain Text! *First*, the *Angels* know it, *when it pleases God to let them know it.* Very right, Sr; for to be sure, they would not know it, unless it pleased God to let them know it. But being conscious to yourself that this will not do your Business, your answer 2*dly*, that perhaps the *Angels* only know it, when the Sinner comes to Heaven. But here the Text is plainly against you, which speaks of their Rejoycing over a sinner *repenting*, or *doing Penance*; which has a manifest Reference to this Life. However if this will not do, then you come upon me with your *Corps de Réserve*, and answer me. 3*dly*, *that it is no where said*, that the *Angels* know of *every Penitent* upon Earth. But do's *Christ* make any *Exception?* And if he do's not, why will you presume to do it for him?

§. 6.

St Paul *to the* Coloss. 2. *v.* 18. 19. *grossly misinterpreted by the* Gentleman.

G. MY Lord, instead of the Schoolmen's *Looking-glass*, and their vain *Philosophy*, if we would look into the plain Directions of *Scriptures*, we should settle ourselves upon a much surer foundation. See then what the *Apostle* says upon the very Case in Hand. *Let no Man beguile you of your Reward in a voluntary Humility, and Worshipping of Angels, intruding into those Things, which he has not seen, vainly puff'd up by his fleshly Mind, and not holding the Head, from which all the Body by joints and Bands having Nourishment minister'd encreaseth with the Encrease of God.* Coloss. 2. *v.* 18. 19. And after says, *v.* 23. *which Things have indeed a Shew of Wisdom in Will-worship and Humility.*——Here is a full Answer to all your Pretensions for this *Will-worship* of *Saints* and *Angels*. For *both go upon the same Foot*. It is call'd *intruding into Things we have not seen*, of which we are altogether uncertain, and therefore sinful in the Practice by the Apostles Rule. *Rom.* 14. *v.* 23. *that whatsoever is not of Faith is Sin.* This was spoke in respect of *Meats*, but is much more so as to our *Worship*, and solemn *Devotions* of *God*.

Your *Comparison* of Access to an *Earthly King* is here call'd a *fleshly* or *Carnal Thought* Measuring *God* after the Manner of *Men*.——

L. Hold, Sr, I told you just now, that the *Comparison* you speak of, is *a Pig of your own Sow*. So let it be as *fleshly* and *Carnal* as you please.

G. And the Result of this is no less than *Losing*

» *our Reward*, that is, *Heaven*. For it is *Forſaking the* » *Head*, which is *Chriſt*, whoſe *Members* we are, and » receive *Nourishment* from him: Not ſo from *Saints* » and *Angels*. pag. 115. 116.

L. That's very true, Sr; All our *Spiritual Nourishment* comes from *Chriſt* our *Head*, and not from *Saints* or *Angels*. But I never could ſuſpect, that the *Prayers* of *Saints* and *Angels* (for pray remember *they both go upon the ſame Foot*) ſhould hinder *Chriſtians* from Receiving *Nourishment* from *Jeſus-Chriſt* their *Head*, any more than the *joint-prayers* of their *Fellow-Members* upon Earth. Unleſs either *Praying* in *Heaven* be a Crime, which obſtructs the Flowings of *God's Grace* upon the *Members* of his *Church Militant*, or *Deſiring* a *Share* in thoſe Prayers deſtroys the *Fruit*, and *Efficacy*, they would otherwiſe have.

But, before I give a direct Anſwer to St *Paul's* Words, I muſt do you the Juſtice to own, you are in no Danger of Wronging your Cauſe for Want of a Good Aſſurance. For when you talk of *Setling ourſelves upon a ſure Foundation*, and conclude the *Text* of St *Paul* with theſe *big* Words, *that it is a full Anſwer to all our Pretenſions for our Will-worship* (as you call it) *of Saints and Angels*, who would imagine any Thing leſs, than that the *Invocation of Saints and Angels*, that is, *Deſiring a Part in their Prayers*, is ſo *clearly condemn'd* by St *Paul*, that his Words are utterly incapable of any other Meaning, than as you pretend to underſtand them.

Now, Sr, to let you ſee, how notoriouſly you impoſe upon the Credulity of ignorant People, I ſhall endeavour to prove, that your Interpretation of the foremention'd Words of St *Paul* is both *abſurd* and *impious*. I prove it to be *abſurd* from a Principle, which I think cannot be conteſted, viz. *that the Saints and Angels in Heaven pray to God for us*. But

since Experience has taught me, that you make no scruple to question the very cleareſt Truths, I shall give myself the Trouble to prove it.

Firſt, from *Zachary* C. 1. ℣. 12. where an *Angel* prays thus for *Jeruſalem*, and the Cities of *Judah*. *Then the Angel of the Lord anſwer'd and ſaid, O Lord of Hoſts, how long will't thou not have Mercy on Jeruſalem, and on the Cities of Judah againſt which thou haſt had Indignation theſe threeſcore and ten Years.*

2*dly*, from this Maxim of St *Paul*, viz. *that Charity never ceaſeth.* 1. Cor. 13. ℣. 8. That is, thô *Faith*, and many other Virtues ceaſe in Heaven, as being inconſiſtent with the State of Bliſs, yet *Charity*, by which we love *God* above all Things, and our *Neighbour* as ourſelves, not only remains, but is undoubtedly encreaſed in Heaven. And therefore if *Charity* even in this World obliges us to be ſolicitous, and pray for one another's Salvation, ſurely the *Angels* and *Saints* in *Heaven*, whoſe *Charity* ſurpaſſes ours by many Degrees, cannot fail of Performing their Part in Sending up their Prayers to the *Throne of Grace* for thoſe, who are yet *Combating* in the *Warfare* of this mortal Life, and uncertain of their future State.

This Argument is admirably well handled by Mr *Thorndike* an eminent *Proteſtant* Writer in his *juſt Weights and Meaſures*, C. 16. pag. 107. where he diſcourſes thus. *All Members*, ſays he, *of the Church Triumphant in Heaven according to their Degree of Favour with God abound alſo with Love to his Church Militant on Earth. Therefore it is certain, both that* THEY OFFER CONTINUAL PRAYERS TO GOD *for it's Neceſſities, and that their Prayers muſt be of great Force and Effect with God for the Aſſiſtance of the Church Militant in this Warfare. Which if it be true, the Communion of Saints will neceſſarily require*, firſt, *that all, &c.* ——— 2*dly*, THAT THE LIVING BEG OF GOD A PART

AND INTEREST IN THOSE PRAYERS, WHICH THEY, WHO ARE SO NEAR TO GOD IN HIS KINGDOM TENDER TO HIM WITHOUT CEASING, FOR THE CHURCH UPON EARTH.

3*dly*. From Pſalm 91. ℣. 11. 12. *He ſhall give his Angels Charge over thee in all thy Ways. They ſhall bear thee up in their Hands, leaſt thou dash thy Foot againſt a Stone.* Now ſurely thoſe *Divine Spirits*, whom God has appointed to take Care of us; and *who always ſee the Face of the Father, which is in Heaven* (Math. 18. ℣. 10.) cannot be ſo unconcern'd for the Perſons under their Charge, as not to offer up their Prayers for them. Nay it is expreſly writ; *that the Smoke of the Incenſe of the Prayers of the Saints aſcended up before God out of the Angel's Hands.* Rev. 8. ℣. 4.

4*thly*. 'Tis beyond Diſpute, that this was the Belief of the *Ancient Church* in her pureſt Times. *Who doubts*, ſays *Origen*, *that all the Saints both help us by their Prayers, and encourage us by their Example?* And again, *We all dare confidently ſay, that Millions of holy Angels join themſelves with Men of good Will when they pray and intercede for us, and are (as it were) Fellow-labourers with us in our ſpiritual Warfare.* L. 8. contra Celſum. Edit. Huet. *pag.* 949.

The *Centuriſts* acknowledge this to be the Doctrine of St *Cyprian*, of whom they write thus. *Verily* Cyprian *do's not obſcurely think, that Martyrs and Saints departed do pray for the Living.* Cent. 3. Coll. 84.

St *Hilary* writes thus. *There are according to St* John *Angels deputed for the Churches of Aſia ----- And in the Doctrine of our Saviour, the Angels of little ones do always ſee the Face of God. There are (according to* Raphael *ſpeaking to* Tobias) *Angels attending before the Divine Majeſty, and offering up to God the Prayers of ſuch as call upon them.* Comment. in Pſ. 129.

Tell

Tell me then (says St *Chrysostom*) *dare you say the Lord is Dead, whose Servants tho deceased are Patrons and Defenders of those, who command the whole Earth?* Hom. 16. in Epist. 2. ad Cor.

When *Vigilantius* An. 404. deny'd the *Intercession* of *Saints*, St *Jerom* reply'd; *if the Apostles and Martyrs pray'd for others in this World (when they were in Concern for themselves) how much more after their Crowns, Victories, and Triumphs?* Moses *obtain'd Pardon for* 600000 *Men*; Stephen *begg'd Pardon for his Persecutors; and since they are with Christ, will they have less Power?* Libro contra *Vigilantium*.

To omit many more for Brevity's Sake, St *Leo's* Words are very remarkable. *We are bound* (says he) *to thank our Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ, who gave such great Power to him, whom he constituted Head of the whole Church, that if any Thing be well done even by us, it must be imputed to him to whom he said*, and when thou art converted, confirm thy Brethren, *and to whom our Lord after his Resurrection said thrice*, feed my Sheep. *Which now also without Doubt this Godly Pastor performs confirming us with his Exhortations, and* NOT CEASING TO PRAY FOR US, *that we be not overcome by any Temptation.* Leo Serm. 3. in Anniver. Assumpt. ad Pontificatum.

In a Word, Sr, I fairly defy you to produce the Authority of one single *Orthodox Father* denying that the *Saints* and *Angels* pray for us. I will therefore proceed to my ------

5th and last Proof of it from the Testimony of *Protestant* Writers. I have already quoted Mr *Thorndike*; and the *Bishop* of *Oxford* in his Edition of St *Cyprian* p. 271. agrees exactly with him, and delivers it as the general Doctrine of his *Church*. *We do not doubt* (says he) *but the Souls in Heaven pray earnestly to God, that he may shew his Mercy to those, that live here.*

Bishop *Mountague* comes a Step nearer to us, and writes thus. *I ſee no Abſurdity in Nature, nor incongruity unto the Analogy of Faith; No repugnance at all to ſacred Scripture, much leſs Impiety for any Man to ſay,* HOLY ANGEL GUARDIAN PRAY FOR US. Treatiſe of Invocation of Saints. *p.* 97.

The *Lutherans* in their Defence of the *Confeſſion* of *Auſbourg* infer from the foremention'd *Text* of *Zachary*, that *Angels pray for us.* Apol. Confeſſ. Auguſt. de Invoc. Sanct. Fol. 179.

Oecolampadius (ad Orat. *Chryſoſt.* de *Juventio* & *Maximo* Martyribus) writes thus. *Neither will I affirm it to be Idolatry to deſire the Patronage of Saints. For the Saints in Heaven being inflamed with Charity do not ceaſe to pray for us.*

Faber (de ſtatu defunctorum C. 7.) writes plainly thus. *I do not doubt but the Souls of the Dead remember their Parents, Brothers, Siſters, and Kindred, whom they left behind; and pray to God, that he will alſo deliver them out of this Vale of Tears.*

Brentius ad Cap. 16. Lucæ, propoſes this Queſtion, *do the Dead then pray for the Living?* Which he anſwers thus. *Surely it cannot be deny'd, that they, who Live with Chriſt, wish well to the Church and her Members. For, if the Angels pray for us, as* Zachary *witneſſeth, and if Chriſt himſelf prays for us to his Father, how ſhould the Saints not be affected with Charity towards us in Chriſt, and through Chriſt?*

Laſtly, the *Church of England* has this *Collect* upon the Day of St *Michael* and *all Angels* in the *Common-Prayer* Book. *O everlaſting God, who haſt ordain'd and conſtituted the Services of Angels and Men in a wonderful Order, mercifully grant, that as thy holy Angels always do thee Service in Heaven, ſo by thy Appointment they may ſuccour and defend us on Earth through Jeſus-Chriſt our Lord.* Amen. Here, Sr, *your Church* hopes for

Succour and *Defence* from the *Angels*: and I desire you to remember your own Maxim, *that Saints, and Angels are upon the same Foot.*

G. But pray, My Lord, what do you infer from this great Heap of Authorities? For here seems to be *much Cry, but no Wool.*

L. Sr, I infer *first* from this unanimous Agreement of *Scriptures*, *Fathers*, and *Protestant Writers*, that it is an undoubted Truth, *that the Saints and Angels in Heaven pray for us.* And from this *Principle* (which alone decides the whole Question concerning the *Invocation* of *Saints*) I infer *2dly*, that your Interpretation of St *Paul* to the *Colossians* is *absurd:* Because it is inconsistent with common Sense to maintain, that *we lose our Reward*, and *forsake the Head*, which is *Christ*, by Desiring a Part and Interest in those Prayers, which by God's own *Appointment* the *Saints* and *Angels* offer to him without Ceasing for the *Church* upon Earth. What, Sr! can you believe that your *Angel Guardian* prays for you, and yet think it *unlawful* to desire it of him? Can you *hope* for *Succour* and *Defence* from *Angels*, and at the same Time believe you *forsake Jesus-Christ*, and *lose your Reward*, if you *beg* of them that *Succour* and *Defence*, for which Almighty God has appointed them to be our *Guardians!* If this be not Shocking common Sense, I confess I know not what is.

I shall now proceed to prove likewise the second Part of my Charge, viz. *that your Interpretation of St Paul to the Colossians is impious.* I have already produced the Testimony of several holy *Fathers* both of the 4th and 5th Age teaching and practising the *Invocation* of *Saints* and *Angels.* Nay that it was the publick Practice of those two Ages is a Thing so Notorious, that a Man must outface Evidence to deny it. However, to leave no Room to doubt of the

Matter, let *Proteſtants* themſelves be Witneſſes of it.

Biſhop Forbes ſpeaks in general Terms thus. *It has been a Practice*, ſays he, *for many Ages in the whole Church, in the Eaſt as much as in the Weſt, and even in the North by the Moſcovits* [Your great Church of *Ruſſia*] *to ſing this Litany for Example*, ST PETER PRAY FOR US. pag 311.

Dr *Fulk* (in his Rejoinder to Briſtow, *p.* 5.) ſays, *I confeſs that* Ambroſe, Auſtin, *and* Jerom *held Invocation of Saints to be lawful.* And again (againſt Rhem. Teſt. *pag.* 443.) *that many of the ancient Fathers held this Opinion, that Saints departed pray for us, we do not deny.*

Chemnitius a learned and zealous *Lutheran* maintains, that the *Invocation* of *Saints* was begun in *publick Aſſemblies* about the Years 370. by St *Baſil*, St *Gregory Nyſſen*, and St *Gregory Nazianzen*. In Exam. Conc. Trid. part. 3. p. 200.

Beza (Præf. Novi Teſt.) ſpeaking of the Times of *Cyprian*, *Auſtin*, and *Chryſoſtom*, acknowledges, that then prevail'd the *Invocation* of the *Dead*.

The *Centuriſts* (Cent. 5. C. 6. Col. 675.) charge St *Chryſoſtom's* Liturgy with *Invocation* of our *Bleſſed Lady* by Name. And again (Cent. 4. Col. 295.) they alledge ſeveral Examples of *Prayers* to *Saints* in *Athanaſius*, *Baſil*, *Nazianzen*, *Ambroſe*, *Prudentius*, *Epiphanius*, and *Ephrem*.

Laſtly Mr *Therndike* writes thus. *It is confeſſed*, ſays he, *that the Lights both of the Greek and Latin Church, St Baſil, St Gregory Nazianzen, St Gregory Nyſſen, St Ambroſe, St Jerom, St Auſtin, St Chryſoſtom, St Cyril of Jeruſalem, St Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, St Fulgentius, St Gregory the Great, St Leo, More or rather all after that Time have ſpoken to the Saints, and deſired their Aſſiſtance.* In Epil. par. 3. pag. 338.

This, I think, is abundantly ſufficient to prove that the *Invocation* of *Saints* was both taught and practiſed by the *greateſt Lights* of the *Church* in thoſe very Ages, when she was moſt eminent both for *Holineſs* and *Learning*; Since the Fact is ſo clear, that her very *Enemies* are forced to acknowledge it.

Now, Sr, this shews the *Impiety* of your *Interpretation* of St *Paul* to the *Coloſſians*. For it follows from it by a manifeſt, and undeniable Conſequence, that all thoſe *great Lights* and *Pillars* of the *Church*: thoſe *eminent Saints*, whom the whole *Chriſtian* World has ever held in Veneration both for their *Holineſs* and *Learning*, it follows, I ſay, that they all *forſook Chriſt*, and *loſt their Reward*: that is to ſay in plain *Engliſh*, that they are *all damn'd*. I really have the Charity to think you never reflected upon this Conſequence. But I am very confident, that whoever reflects upon it, unleſs he be a *profeſs'd Atheiſt*, will deteſt your Saying, that the *Invocation* of *Saints* (which, *even our Enemies being Judges*, was taught and practiſed by thoſe great Men) is *forſaking Chriſt*, and *Loſing our Reward*.

Your Interpretation therefore of St *Paul* being inconſiſtent both with *Piety*, and *common Senſe*, I hope you will allow me to give one, that agrees with both. Now 'tis manifeſt, that the principal Subject of the Chapter you have quoted from St *Paul* to the *Coloſſians* is to eſtabliſh the *Divinity* of *Chriſt*, his Superiority over the *Angels*, and *Mediatorſhip* between God and Man. *In him* (ſays he) *are hid all the Treaſures of Wiſdom and Knowledge.* ℣. 3. *For in him dwelleth the Fulneſs of the Godhead Corporally; and ye are compleat in him, who is the Head of all Principality and Power, &c.* ℣. 9. 10. Whence in the Words you have objected, the Apoſtle takes Occaſion to warn the *Coloſſians* againſt the pernicious Doctrine of thoſe,

who taught, that it was not *Christ* but *Angels*, who were our Mediators, and Reconcilers with God; whom therefore he juſtly accuſes of *not holding the Head*, which is *Chriſt*.

This, Sr, is St *Chryſoſtom's* Comment upon the very Words, you have ſtrain'd into an Objection againſt us. *They* (ſays he, ſpeaking of thoſe, againſt whoſe Seduction St *Paul* precautions the *Coloſſians*) *affirm, that we ought to be reconciled to God not by Chriſt but Angels* (in Epiſt. ad Col. 2. 68.) *dicunt non oportere per Chriſtum adduci nos ad Deum, ſed per Angelos.* Which blaſphemous Doctrine the Apoſtle calls *a fleshly and carnal Thought*, and *an Intruding into Things we have not ſeen.* He likewiſe calls it a *Will-worship*, and *a falſe or affected Humility* in ſubmitting themſelves to thoſe as their *Mediators*, and *Reconcilers to God*, who are utterly incapable of that high Office, which certainly belongs to *Chriſt* alone. When therefore you can prove, that our Deſiring the Prayers of *Saints* and *Angels* is the *ſacrilegious Worship* here deſcribed: that is, when you can prove us guilty of taking away the *Mediatorship* from *Chriſt*, and attributing it to *Angels*, it will then be Time enough to ſwagger, and tell me, *that St* Paul's *Words are a full Anſwer to all our Pretenſions for our Invocation of Saints and Angels.*

G. My Lord, *Whatever is not of Faith is Sin* according to the *Apoſtle's* Rule, *Rom.* 14. ℣. 23. But it is not of *Faith* that the *Saints* hear us, therefore it is ſinful in Practice to invoke them.

L. A notable Argument indeed! And to ſhew you the full Strength of it, I retort it thus. *Whatever is not of Faith is ſin.* But it is not of *Faith*, that an abſent Friend will receive my Letter, whereby I deſire his *Prayers*, therefore it is ſinful to deſire by Letter the Prayers of an abſent Friend. I think a

Man needs not be a Conjurer to anſwer either. But, to leave off Trifling, St *Paul's* true Meaning is, that whatever is done *mala fide*, that is, *againſt Conſcience*, is *ſinful* in Practice. And if you can prove, that we act *againſt Conſcience* in Deſiring the Prayers of *Saints*, then St *Paul's* Rule will be againſt us.

§. 7.

The Difference between a Mediator *of* Redemption, *and a* Mediator *of* Interceſſion.

C. MY Lord, God has given *Chriſt* to us as « the *one Mediator between God and Man*, « 1. Tim. 2. ℣. 5. But you have made to yourſelves « *many Mediators* to aſſiſt and help him, as if his « *Mediation*, and *Interceſſion* were not ſufficient. *pag.* « 116. «

L. Sr, if St *Paul* thought the *Mediation* and *Interceſſion* of *Chriſt inſufficient*, and made *many Mediators* to himſelf when he deſired the *Prayers* of the *Romans*, Rom. 15. 30. Then we are guilty of the ſame Crime in Deſiring a Part in the *Prayers* of the *Saints*. But every one, that is but well inſtructed in his Catechiſm, will tell you, that, tho there be but *one Mediator* of *Redemption* (of which St *Paul* ſpeaks) yet all, that pray for us, may *improperly* be call'd *Mediators* of *Prayer*, or *Interceſſion*. I ſay *improperly*, becauſe there is only *one* (to wit, *Jeſus Chriſt*) who can have *immediate Acceſs* to God for us; and all others, that pray for us, muſt uſe his *Mediation* as well as we ourſelves, when we direct our Prayers to God.

In this Senſe therefore there are *many Mediators*, and whoever prays for another, *mediates* (as it were) between *him* and *Almighty God*. In this Senſe St *Paul* teaches us *Gal.* 3. ℣. 19. *that the Law was ordain'd by*

Angels in the Hand of a Mediator, which *Theodoret* ſays was *Moſes*. Tom. 3. pag. 276. And *Moſes* ſaid thus of himſelf, *I ſtood between the Lord and you at that Time*, Deut. 5. ℣. 5. In this Senſe the *Lutheran Profeſſion* of *Wittemberg* ſays, Tit. de ordine. *If we mean a Mediator of Prayer, every good Man is another's Mediator through* Jeſus Chriſt: *becauſe it is every Man's Duty to recommend the Salvation of others by Prayers to God.* This is our Doctrine clearly and fully explain'd.

Bishop *Mountague* ſpeaks the ſame Language in antidot. *pag.* 10. *I do not deny* (ſays he) *but the Saints are Mediators* (as they are call'd) *of Prayer and Interceſſion ..... They interpoſe with God by their Supplications, and mediate by their Prayers.* And again in his Treatiſe of *Invoc.* pag. 118. he ſays of us: *I grant Chriſt is not wrong'd in his Mediation. It is no impiety to ſay as they do*, holy Mary pray for us, holy Peter pray for me. This worthy *Proteſtant* will, I hope, teach you ſome *Moderation*, and make you blush at what you juſt now told me, viz. *that we make to ourſelves many Mediators* TO ASSIST AND HELP CHRIST, *as if his Mediation and Interceſſion were* NOT SUFFICIENT; which is *Wronging* Chriſt in the higheſt Degree.

» *G.* My Lord, you make more Applications to » *Saints*, than to *Chriſt*, or to *God* himſelf. You » have ten *Ave Marias* for one *Pater noſter.* pag. » 116.

L. Sr, every Prayer, by which I invoke the Saints has it's principal Tendency to God, ſince I only deſire them to pray *to him* for me: and 'tis from him alone I expect the Bleſſings, for which I deſire the Aſſiſtance of their Prayers. So that ten *Ave Mary's* are in Effect ten Petitions to God for ſuch or ſuch a Favour through the Interceſſion of his bleſſed Mother. And is not this a moſt grievous Scandal!

G. My

G. My Lord, you have multiplied your *Saints* « without Number like *Heathen Deities*, and new *Ca-* « *nonizations* are going on every Day. *pag.* 116. «

L. But, Sr, are *Saints* the worse for being many in Number? Or are you afraid the *old ones* will be forced to quit their Place in Heaven to make Room for *New-comers*? I assure you, Sr, no *Protestant Saint* will be a sufferer by it. Your pretty Comparison shall be consider'd immediately.

G. Every *Country*, *City*, *Parish*, and almost Per- « son have a particular *Saint* for their *Patron*. p. 116. « 117. «

L. So much the better, Sr, I am glad to hear it. Every Man has his *Angel-Guardian* to *succor* and *de-fend* him: and if he has besides a *Saint* to *pray* for him, is there any Harm in it?

G. You have *Saints*, as the *Heathens* had *Gods* « for the *Sea*, for the *Air*, *Fire*, &c. for *Peace*, for « *War*, for *Learning*, for all Sorts of *Trades* and *Oc-* « *cupations*. pag. 117. «

L. But with this Difference at least, that the *Hea-thens* not only made *Gods* of most wicked and flagi-tious Men, as *Drunkards*, *Robbers*, *Whore-mongers*, &c. but *offer'd Sacrifice* to them, which is due to God alone: and we only implore the *Prayers* of Persons, whose *Holiness* and *happy State* nothing but the blackest Malice can question.

G. St *Christopher*, and St *Clement* are for the Sea, « especially the *Virgin Mary*, to whom the *Seamen* « sing *Ave maris stella*. pag. 117. «

L. Well, Sr! and is not that much better than *Cursing* and *Swearing* in the Midst of a Storm?

G. St *Agatha* is for the *Fire*, and they make « *Letters* on her Day to quench *Fire* with? pag. 117. «

L. Sr, I suspect this Story comes out of some *Protestant Mint*; and I shoud be glad to know the

Country or *Town*, where this is practiſed, and allow'd of.

» *G.* St *Nicholas* and St *Gregory* are for *Schollars*, » St *Luke* for *Painters*, &c. And you have *Saints* for » all *Diſeaſes*. St *Cornelis* cures the *Falling Sickneſs*, » St *Apollonia* the *Tooth-ach*, St *Roche* the *Pox*, &c. » *pag.* 117.

L. The *Pox* do you ſay? For Shame, Sr! The *Plague* you ſhould have ſaid. But it is no Sin to belye the *Church of Rome*. Go on.

» *G.* Your People have Particular *Saints* for all » *Beaſts* and *Cattle*. St *Eloy* preſides over the *Horſes*, » and St *Antony* over the *Swine*, &c. and they bring » their Cattle to be *bleſſed* by theſe *Saints* on their » particular Days. And they pray to theſe *Saints* » jointly with *God*. A Schollar ſays, *God and St Ni-* » *cholas be my Speed*. And when one ſneezes, *God help* » you *and St John*. And to a Horſe if he ſtumbles, *God* » *and St* Eloy *ſave thee*. And upon every Surprize they » cry, *Jeſus Maria*. pag. 117.

L. Surely, Sr, it ſhews a much more pious Diſpoſition to cry *Jeſus Maria*, than *God damn me* upon every Surprize. But as to the other fine Saying mention'd by you, I cannot imagine where you have pick'd them up. For I have converſed with many *Schollars* in my Life-time: I have alſo heard many a Man *Sneeze*, and ſeen many Horſes *Stumble*; yet I cannot remember I ever heard any of the Prayers you mention. But let it be ſo; where is the Harm in Calling upon *God*, and St *Nicholas* or any other *Saint* at the ſame Time? The *Saints* are united to *God* in *eternal Bliſs*; and if I join them together in my *Thoughts*, or name them together in my *Prayer*; that is, if I *pray God*, and invoke his *Saints* at the ſame Time, I hope 'tis better at leaſt than *Lampooning* God in his Saints.

G. My Lord, to pray to the *Saints* jointly with *God* is ſomewhat too familiar, and looks like putting them upon the *Level.*

L. Ay, Sr, it would do ſo, if we pray'd to the *Saints* as we do to *God.* But if we only invoke the *Saints* as *Interceſſors* at the ſame Time that we call upon *God* as *the Giver of all good Gifts*, there is no Danger of Putting them upon the *Level. Prayer* is the *Deſire* or *Affection* of the *Heart*, and if the Heart moves at the ſame Time towards *God* and his *Saints*, or towards *Chriſt* and his *Bleſſed Mother*, as when I ſay, *Jeſus Maria*, do's it make no Difference between the *Creator* and the *Creature?* If ſo, then it will be *Blaſphemy* to *praiſe God in his Saints:* Becauſe in that Act I muſt of Neceſſity *join God* and his *Saints* together. Nay I cannot *praiſe God in his Saints*, but in the ſame Act whether I will or not, I *praiſe* and *Honour* the *Saints* with an *inferiour* or *Relative Honour.*

What you tell me concerning St *Eley's* PRESIDING (as you term it) over *Horſes*, and St *Antony* over the *Swine*, is a very curious Piece of *Erudition*, to which I was an utter ſtranger till now.

But, to give a ſhort Anſwer to this whole Piece of *Buffoonery*, we honour all *God's Saints*, becauſe they were his faithful *Servants* on Earth, and are honour'd by him as his *Friends* in Heaven. And if the People addreſs themſelves to this or that particular *Saint* rather than others, 'tis not becauſe there is a *Diviſion of Offices* among the *Saints*, or that they may not all equally intercede for any Favour without Entrenching upon each other's *Prerogative*, but becauſe (according to St *Auſtin's* Remark Epiſt. 78. olim 137. §. 3.) as the *Saints* have their *ſeveral Gifts* beſtow'd upon them in *this Life*, ſo Almighty God thinks fit to honour them *differently* in *Heaven*. And

the People that invoke them, have found by Experience, that God is pleased to grant such or such particular Favours through their *Intercession*. But your Comparing on this score God's *Saints* with the *Heathen Deities* is a most Unchristian Reflection, because we do not honour them as *Gods*, but as the *Friends*, and *Servants* of God, of whom alone we hope to obtain the Blessings, for which we desire their Prayers.

§. 8.

St Austin Falsified.

» *G.* THe Word *Gods* is frequently given in » *Scripture* to *Angels*, and to *Men* as *Minis-* » *ters* of *God*.---

L. It is so sometimes. What then?

» *G.* Thus the *Heathens* understood it, and sup- » posed their *Gods* to be such *Ministers*, as *Æolus* to » govern the *Winds*, *Neptune* the *Sea*, &c. Therefore » they call'd them *Dii Medioxumi*, inferiour Gods, » as standing in the Middle betwixt the *Supreme God* » and us to succour and punish us according to his » Orders. *pag.* 117. 118.

L. It seems then according to you, that the *Heathens* in calling those *Gods*, whom they had deified, understood that Word in a very innocent sense, and as it is sometimes taken in Scriptures for the Ministers of the *true supreme God*. Really, Sr, with a few touches more of your exquisite Skill it is to be hoped the *Heathens* will shortly be transform'd into *true Worshippers*. But they have unluckily spoil'd all, and explain'd their own Meaning in *Fact* by Offering *Sacrifices* to their *inferiour Gods* no less than to their *Supreme God* Jupiter: which is a convincing

Proof, that they regarded them all as *truly Gods*, and were blind enough to believe, that there were *Higher* and *Lower Degrees* amongst the *Gods* as well as amongst *Creatures*: Tho in Reality both their *Higher*, and *Lower Gods* were but *Devils*, or *evil Spirits*.

G. St *Austin*, who knew them well, tells us what they argued for themselves. They said, *we do not Worship evil Damons or Spirits, but we Worship those, whom you* [Christians] *call Angels, the Powers of the great, the Ministers of the great God.* August. in Ps. 96. But St *Austin* answer'd them, *that they must be evil Spirits, whom they worshipped, because they required Worship from Men as the Devil did from our Saviour*; which the *good Angels* always refused. And he quotes, *Rev.* 19. ℣. 10. and 22. ℣. 9. where the *Angel* forbad *John* to worship him. And the same did the *Saints* upon Earth; as *Peter* refused it from *Cornelius*, Act. 10. ℣. 26. And *Paul* and *Barnabas* from the Men of *Lystra*. Act. 14. ℣. 14. 15. pag. 118.

L. Sr, it is no Wonder the *Heathens* would not own their Gods to be *evil Spirits*. But St *Austin* upon the 96 *Psalm* quoted by you confutes them very solidly, and I am sorry I must here accuse you of a notorious *Falsification* of that *Father's* Answer to the *Heathens*. You say his Answer is thus. Viz. *That they must be evil Spirits, whom they worshipped; because they required* WORSHIP *from Men.*

Now the Word WORSHIP is *equivocal*, and may either signify *Divine Worship*, or that *inferiour* or *Relative* Honour, which we pay to *Saints* and *Angels*. Therefore to render it at least *doubtful*, which of the *two Worships* St *Austin* condemn'd in his Answer to the *Heathens*, you have very dexterously alter'd his Words, which, if truly quoted are *clear*, and incapable of a *double Meaning*. His true Words are

theſe. *Die mihi, Damonia colis, an ſpiritus bonos, quales ſunt Angeli? Sunt enim Angeli ſancti, & ſunt Spiritus maligni. Ego dico in Templis tuis non coluntur niſi Spiritus maligni. Qui ſibi exigunt ſuperbe* SACRIFICIUM, *& volunt ſe coli* TANQUAM DEOS, *maligni ſunt, ſuperbi ſunt.* That is to ſay, *Tell me do you worſhip Devils or holy Spirits, ſuch as Angels are? For there are holy Angels, and there are evil Spirits: I ſay that in your Temples only evil Spirits are worſhipped. For they, who proudly require* SACRIFICE *to be offerr'd to them, and will be worſhipped* AS GODS *are evil and proud Spirits.*

Theſe, Sr, are St *Auſtin's* Words upon the 96. *Pſalm.* and your Tranſlating them as you have done, is ſuch a Piece of Diſingenuity, as all Men of Honour and Conſcience will deteſt. For it is manifeſt, and you cannot but be conſcious of it to yourſelf, that his Words *expreſs* and *ſpecify* that *Worſhip*, which is OFFERING SACRIFICE, and can therefore render you no Manner of Service againſt our *Invocation* of *Saints* and *Angels*, unleſs you can prove, that we *offer Sacrifice* to 'em, and *Worſhip* them AS GODS, which the blackeſt Malice cannot accuſe us of.

You ſay St *Auſtin* quotes Rev. 19. ℣. 10. and 22. ℣. 9. *Where the Angel forbad St John to worſhip him.* To which St *Auſtin* himſelf anſwers for me: *that the Angel appear'd in ſuch a Manner, that he might have been adored as God, and therefore St* John's *Miſtake was to be corrected.* Aug. Quæſt. 61. in Gen.

After which you quote St *Peter* Refuſing *Worſhip* from *Cornelius.* To which I anſwer, that tho the *Worſhip* intended by *Cornelius* was no more than a *Reſpect* due to St *Peter's Character*, he refuſed it out of *Humility.* For if what *Cornelius* did, was in itſelf unlawful, then kneeling to a Parent, or the King is likewiſe unlawful.

Laſtly, you produce the example of *Paul* and *Barnabas* Refuſing *Worſhip* from the *Men of Lyſtra*. Act. 14. v. 11. *&c.* But do not the *Acts* themſelves tell us what *Sort* of *Worſhip* theſe Men intended? *The Gods*, ſaid they, *are come down to us in the Likeneſs of Men. And they call'd Barnabas* Jupiter, *and Paul* Mercury, *becauſe he was the chief Speaker. Then the Prieſt of* Jupiter *brought Oxen and Garlands, and would have done Sacrifice to Barnabas and Paul, &c.* And had they not then Reaſon to refuſe *this Worſhip* from them? But if the *Men of Lyſtra* had only deſired their *Prayers*, as we do thoſe of the *Saints* and *Angels*, would *Paul* and *Barnabas* have Scrupled to grant their Requeſt?

§. 9.

The ſcandalous Parallel between the Heathen Worſhip, *and that of* Roman Catholicks *confuted.*

ADVERTISEMENT.

After the Gentleman's *laſt Words in his* Caſe ſtated, *pag.* 118. *his* Lordſhip *is ſo very ignorant as to anſwer*, that the Heathens worſhipped every one of their Gods as ſupreme. *Which Blunder was neceſſary to introduce the* ſcandalous Parallel *between the* Heathens, *and* Roman Catholicks.

I call it ſcandalous, 1. *becauſe* Idolatry *is a Crime of the blackeſt Nature; and nothing can be a more* Scandalous *Calumny, than to fix it upon ſo conſiderable a Body of* Chriſtians, *as* Roman Catholicks *are, unleſs the Charge be made out with ſuch* ſtrong *and* undeniable evidence, *that no Man of Senſe can oppoſe or deny it.*

I call it ſcandalous, 2. *becauſe is* Unchurches *the*

whole Church of Christ *for many Ages before the* pretended Reformation: *in which Ages the* Invocation of Saints *was taught and practised by the* whole Christian Church *upon Earth, as I have already proved even from the Testimony of* Protestant *Writers*.

Lastly, I call it a Scandalous Parallel, *because it not only* damns *the* whole Church *(that was) of* Great Britain *for* 900 *Years before the* Reformation, *but turns all the most eminent* Saints *and* Doctors *of the* primitive Ages *(who all taught and practised the* Invocation of Saints, *as I have proved) into as rank* Monsters, *or* Ministers of Satan, *as* Idolatry *can make them.*

Now let us have this noble Parallel. *But the Reader, to understand the Connection, must remember his* Lordship's *wise Saying in the former* Conversation, *that* the Heathens worshipped every one of their Gods as Supreme, and independent; *to which the* Gentleman *answers thus*:

» *G.* SOme Men make *Monsters* of others to hide » their own *Deformity*. pag. 118.

L. Sr, your Observation is very just, if it be but duly applied. For *Protestants* make *Monsters* of *Papists* to hide the *Deformity* of their own *Reform'd Churches*.

» *G.* Your Guides have set up this Notion [viz. » *that the Heathens worshipped every one of their Gods* » *as Supreme*] to hinder the *Parallel* betwixt the *Hea-* » *then Worship* of their *inferiour Gods*, and yours of » *Saints* and *Angels*. pag. 118.

L. Sr, I know nothing of the *Notion* you speak of; nor shall I stand in any Need of it to confute your

your *Scandalous Parallel*; which you can never make out, unleſs you either prove that our *Saints* and *Angels* are *evil Spirits*, as the *inferiours Gods* of the *Heathens* were; or that we *offer Sacrifice* to 'em, as the *Heathens* did to their *inferiour Deities*; or that we do not worship the *true God*.

G. My Lord, there is nothing more evident, « than that the *Heathens* did acknowledge *one Supreme* « *and true God*, tho in much Ignorance and Superſtition. *pag.* 119. «

L. Sr, if you mean, that the *Heathens* worshipped the *true God*, there is nothing more evident, than that the *Word of God* is flatly againſt you in innumerable Places. I ſhall only quote two or three to ſatisfy you. *Becauſe* ALL THE GODS OF THE NATIONS *are Devils, but the Lord has made the Heavens.* Pſ. 95. ℣. 5. *They ſacrificed their Sons and Daughters unto Devils.* Pſ. 105. ℣. 37. *I ſay, that the Things, which the Gentiles ſacrifice, they ſacrifice to Devils,* AND NOT TO GOD. 1. Cor. 10. ℣. 20. And have you after this the Confidence to ſay, that *Nothing is more evident than that the Heathens acknowledged*, that is, worſhipped *the true ſupreme God!*

G. My Lord, St *Paul* ſays Rom. 1. ℣. 19, 20. « &c. *That they knew God, that he was manifeſt unto* « *them, even his eternal Power and Godhead. So that* « *they were without Excuſe in their foolish Imagination* « *to change the Glory of the uncorruptible God into an* « *Image made like to the corruptible Man, &c.* And he « told —— «

L. Hold, Sr, you ſhall have full Liberty to proceed as ſoon as I have anſwer'd this Text. St *Paul* ſpeaks here not of *Heathens in General*, but of ſome of the *wiſeſt* amongſt them, who knew *God* by the Light of Nature, but yet their *Worſhip* did not anſwer their *Knowledge*; on the contrary in Compliance

with the People they practiſed the rankeſt Idolatry. And therefore I do not like your, &c. becauſe it *ſtifles* that Part of the *Text*, which utterly ſpoils your *Parallel*. The Text unmangled is thus. *Becauſe that which may be known of God is manifeſt in them; for God has ſhew'd it unto them.* ℣. 19. *For the inviſible Things of him from the Creation of the World are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the Things that are made, even his eternal Power and Godhead, ſo that they are without Excuſe.* ℣. 20. *Becauſe that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were they thankful, but became vain in their Imaginations, and their foolish Heart was darken'd.* ℣. 21. *Profeſſing themſelves Wiſe, they became Fools* ℣. 22. *And changed the Glory of the uncorruptible God into an Image made like to corruptible Man, and to Birds, and four-footed Beaſts, and creeping Things.* ℣. 23. And again ℣. 25. he tells us, *that they changed the Truth of God into a Lie, and Worshipped and ſerved the Creature more than the Creator, who is bleſſed for ever.*

This is the Text; and we have here an exact Deſcription of a Set of Men, who, tho they *knew God* by the Light of Nature from the *wonderful Creation of the World*, yet contrary to that Light they fell into all the fouleſt Practices of *Idolatry*, as *Offering Sacrifice* to the *Statues* of *Jupiter*, *Venus*, *Mercury*, &c. (which the Apoſtle calls, *Changing the glory of the uncorruptible God into an Image made like to corruptible Man*) nay even to the *Statues* of *Birds*, and *four-footed Beaſts*, and *Creeping Things:* whence the *Apoſtle* concludes, that *they changed the Truth of God into a Lye, and Worshipped and ſerved the Creature more than the Creator.* Both which Parts of the *Text* you have very prudently clapp'd under an *&c.* becauſe they lay open the Shame of your *Parallel*, and make it look as *nonſenſical* as it is *ſcandalous*; unleſs

you either prove, that we *Worship* the *Images* of *false Gods*; or that the *Images* of *Birds*, and *four-footed Beasts*, and *Creeping Things* are *Worshipped* by us; or finally, that we pay *Divine Honours* to the *Images* of *Christ* or his *Saints*. Now, Sr, you may go on, where you left off.

G. St *Paul* ſpoke thus to the Athenians. *Whom* « *therefore you ignorantly Worship, him declare I unto* « *you.* Act. 17. ℣. 23. Now he did not preach a *falſe* « *God* unto them: but they had blended the *Worſhip* « *of God* with theſe *inferiour Gods* or *Demons*, which « was their *Superſtition*. For ſo the Word ſignifies « δεισιδαιμονία, the Fear of theſe *Demons*. And it is « thus render'd every where in the *New Teſtament*, « which we tranſlate *Superſtition*. And ſo the *Vulgar* « *Latin*. Act. 17. ℣. 22. and 25. ℣. 19. And the *Latin* « Word *Superſtition* means the ſame Thing, and is « derived, as *Servius* has it, from *Superſtare*, as being « a Fear of thoſe Heavenly Powers, who *ſuperſtant*, « ſtand over us: and ſo *Superſtition* is *Superſtantium* « *rerum timor*. Others derive it from *Superſtites*, that « theſe *Divi ex hominibus facti*, Men *Deified* after their « Death are ſtill *Superſtites*, and the Fear of them as « ſuch is *Superſtition*, or, *qui ſuperſtitem memoriam de-* « *functorum colunt*, who *Worſhip* the *Memory* of *theſe* « *dead Men*. pag. 119. «

L. What a Deal of learned Pedantry have we here about the Derivation of a Word! But to come directly to the Point, the main drift of what you have now ſaid is to ſhew *firſt*, that the *Heathens* worſhipped the *true God*. For unleſs you can prove this, your Parallel betwixt *Heathens* and *Papiſts* is moſt eminently ridiculous, and *2dly*, that their Blending or Mixing the Worſhip of their *inferiour Gods* or *Demons* with that of the *true God* is juſt what *Papiſts* do in Honouring God's *Saints* and *Angels*, and

joining it with their Worship of the *true God*. And ſo you compare our Honouring the Saints in Heaven with the *Heathen* Worship of their Men *deified* by them after their Death.

But, Sr, you forget yourſelf to be a Member of the *Church of England*, which keeps particular holy Days for the *Apoſtles*, St *John Baptiſt*, St *Stephen*, &c. and has one holy Day for all the *Saints* in general, and another for St *Michael*, and all the *Angels*. [*Caſe ſtated*, pag. 135.] Now I call this Paying a *religious Honour* or *Worship* (give it what Name you pleaſe) as we do to God's *Saints* and *Angels*. And if this be *Heathenish Superſtition* in us, I ſhould be glad to know what Name it is to be call'd by, when it is practiſed by *Proteſtants*. But I believe you will be forced to come to this Anſwer, that in the Religious Honour you pay to *Saints* and *Angels* by keeping their holy Days, you do not regard them as *Gods*, but as the faithful Servants and Miniſters of God: nor do you offer Sacrifice to them, as the Heathens did to their inferiour Gods, and that therefore you cannot be accuſed of *heathenish Superſtition* in keeping holy Days in Honour of them. But if this Anſwer will leave no Room for a Parallel between the Heathens and you, I hope it will convince you of the ſcandalous Nonſenſe of the Parallel you make between the *heathen* Worship, and ours: and it follows hence, that tho it were true, as it is moſt falſe, that the *Heathens* worshipped the *true God*, your Parallel would be defective in an eſſential Point.

G. Ay but, My Lord, you do not reflect that we do not pray to the *Saints* and *Angels*, as you do: and this is a material Difference.

L. Sr, it ſerves only to convince the World how incoherent you are with yourſelves. It ſhews your Religion is not built upon ſtedy Principles, but

put together by Humour and Caprice. For is it not a contradiction in Practice to ſcruple at Deſiring the Prayers of *Saints* and *Angels*, when at the ſame Time you make no Scruple to keep *holy Days* in Honour of them? Neither you nor we make any Difficulty to deſire the Prayers of our *Fellow-mortals* upon Earth, who are yet ſubject to many Failings: Yet no Church in the World was ever ſo extravagant as to inſtitute holy Days in Honour of *mortal Men*. Which is a convincing Proof, that inſtituting holy Days in Honour of Creatures is a *religious Honour* or *Worſhip* of a far higher Degree than Deſiring their Prayers; which is all that is meant by *Praying to Saints*. And therefore if there be no Superſtition, or Breach of a Commandement in the one, there can be none in the other.

G. But, My Lord, what do you ſay to the Text, I have quoted from the *Acts* to prove that *the Heathens worſhipped the true God?*

L. I anſwer, it will clear itſelf, if it be but ſet in it's own true Light: it is thus. *As I paſſed* (ſays St *Paul*) *and beheld your Devotions, I found an Altar with this Inſcription*, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. *Whom therefore you ignorantly worſhip* (that is, *without knowing him*) *him I declare unto you.* Then he proceeds to explain to them the Nature and Attributes of God, and tells them amongſt other Things, *that he dwells not in Temples made with hands, nor is like unto Gold, or Silver, or Stone graven by Art, or Man's Device.* Whence I infer that the *Athenians* were wholly ignorant of the ſpiritual and infinitly perfect Nature of God; ſince St *Paul* was forced to inſtruct them in the very firſt Rudiments, we uſually teach Children. I infer again that they worſhipped meerly at Random ſomething they knew not what: and therefore dedicated their Altar to the *unknown God*. In all

Probability they had heard the God of the *Jews* or *Chriſtians* ſpoken of; and as they were fond of any new *Deity* (provided their old ones were not prejudiced by it) they immediately erected an Altar to him. And is not this an admirable Text to ſupport your Parallel! Now let us hear what you have farther to ſay.

» *G.* My Lord, the Heathen Worſhip of their » leſſer Gods is what is forbidden in the firſt Com- » mandement, which reſpects the Object of Wor- » ſhip, that no *religious Worſhip* is to be given to any » but to the ſupreme God alone. The ſecond Com- » mandement relates to the Manner of Worſhip, » that is, by Images. But this your Church has hid- » den from the People, and divided the 10th into » two to keep up the Number, that the People might » think they ſtill have the ten Commandements. And » it is thus in your very Catechiſm *ad parochos*. But » of this hereafter. *pag.* 120.

§. 10.

Of Dividing the Commandements.

L. SIR, I muſt take your Words in Pieces to ſeparate Truth from Falſehood. It is true that the firſt Commandement *reſpects the Object of Worſhip*, and forbids the *Heathen Worſhip of their leſſer Gods*, nay of their great God *Jupiter* alſo. 'Tis likewiſe true, that it forbids *religious Worſhip to be given to any but the ſupreme God alone*; if by *religious Worſhip*, you mean *ſupreme divine Adoration*, or *Offering Sacrifice*. But if you mean, an *inferioun relative Honour*, it is falſe what you ſay; and you muſt grant it to be ſo, unleſs you will own the *Church of England* guilty of a Breach of the firſt Commandement, when-

ever she keeps holy Days for *Saints* and *Angels*, which I am ſure is a *religious Honour*, or *Worship*; call it by what Name you pleaſe.

But when you tell me, that the firſt Commandement forbids religious Worship to be given to any but the *ſupreme God* alone, I ſhould be glad to know, whom you mean by the *ſupreme God*. Do you mean the *ſupreme God* of the *Heathens*, or the *God* of *Chriſtians*? For 'tis certain the *Heathens* had a *God*, whom they regarded as *ſupreme*.

G. My Lord, I have already told you, that *Heathens* worshipped *one ſupreme and true God*, and brought good Proofs for it, and I will prove it more fully hereafter. What need then of your Queſtion, ſince there can be but *one ſupreme true God*.

L. Well then, Sr, I infer that *Jupiter*, who certainly was the *ſupreme God* both of the *Greeks* and *Romans*, was according to you the very ſame *true God*, whom *Chriſtians* now adore; and ſince you now tell me, that the Worship of the *leſſer Heathen Gods* is the Thing preciſely forbid in the *firſt Commandement*, I conclude that according to your Doctrine it is no Breach of that Commandement to Worship *Jupiter*. What Pity is it that you have not printed a true *Proteſtant* Explanation of the ten Commandements!

But you tell me our Church has *hid the ſecond Commandement from the People*, and *divided the tenth into two to keep up the Number*, and that it is thus divided in our *Catechiſm ad Parochos*. Sr, it is thus divided not only in that Catechiſm, but in St *Auſtin* himſelf *Queſt. 71. in Exod.* who maintains expreſly, that what you call the *ſecond Commandement* is but a Part, or fuller Explanation of the *firſt*: and he divides the Commandements as we do. Yet I never heard Saint *Auſtin* tax'd with *hiding* the Commande-

ments from the People, or Designing to put a Trick upon them by *Making them think they had the ten Commandements*, when they had but *Nine*. I must therefore suppose the *learned Fathers*, who were *contemporary* with St *Austin*, or lived in the following Ages, either wanted *your Wit* to *detect*, or *your Zeal* to *reprove* so notorious a *Cheat*. But since you intend to speak *of this hereafter*, I shall wait for your Leisure to give a full Answer to it. In the Mean Time I desire you to remember; that the *Deadly Sin* of *Calumny* is forbid by one of the *ten Commandements*, and you may take my Word for it, that I will prove you guilty of this *Deadly Sin*, whenever you attempt to make good this Charge, viz. *that we hide any of the Commandements from the People*. However all Endeavours are used by the *Ministers* of your *Church* to possess the People with this Notion of us: and it were happy for you and many more that this Commandement, *thou shalt not bear false Witness against thy Neighbour*, had never appear'd in the *Tables* of the *Decalogue*.

I shall here only ask one Question. Viz. Why *your Dividing* the *first Commandement* into *two*, may not with equal Justice be said to have been done *to keep up the Number, that the People might think they still have the ten Commandements*, as *our Dividing* the *Tenth*? For the *Scripture* has not determined the Matter. It only tells us, that there are *ten Commandements*; but how many belong to the *first Table*, and how many to the *second*, or whether the *first* or the *Tenth* is to be divided into *two*, is no where specified.

What you say, viz. *that the second Commandement* (as you call it) *relates only to the Manner of Worship by Images*, is false. On the Contrary it forbids the *Worship of God* to be given to *Images*. And this is the natural Import of these Words, *thou shalt*

shall't not adore nor Worship them. Exod. 20. V. 5. which regards the *Object of Worship* as well as theſe Words, *thou shall't not have ſtrange Gods before me*; And ſurely differs very much from the falſe interpretation you put upon them, viz. *that they forbid the Worship of God by Images.* For how can that be true, ſince God himſelf commanded the *Ark*, and the *Cherubims* to be made *with Reſpect to his Worship?* Or did God *command* and *forbid* the ſelfſame Thing? But it is ſomewhat remarkable, that you ſhould content yourſelf with *barely Aſſerting* a Thing of that Moment, and without ſo much as Offering at the leaſt Proof of it. The only Reaſon I can give for it is, that *Saying* is much eaſier than *Proving.*

ADVERTISEMENT.

The Gentleman's *following Words appear to have no Manner of Connection with what he ſaid laſt. But ſince they immediately follow one another in his* Caſe ſtated, *the Reader muſt take them as they are.*

§. 11.

The Parallel *continued.*

G. THe *Heathens* had their good and evil *De-* «
mons, as their good and evil *Genii*. But ac- «
cording to St *Auſtin's* Rule, they muſt be *evil De-* «
mons, who accepted the *Worship of Men*, which «
were all the *Heathen Demons* ---- «

L. Sr, I muſt make bold to refreſh your Memory; for you have already forgot your *Falſification* of thoſe Words of St *Auſtin*, to which you refer me. So go on.

G. Therefore the Word *Damon* is taken in the «

» worſt Senſe, and tranſlated *Devil* throughout the » *New Teſtament*: and what we tranſlate *the* Doc- » trine of *Devils*. 1. Tim. 4. ℣. 1. is the Doctrine of » the *Dæmones*, or, the *Worſhip* of *Demons*; and a » various Lection has *who Worſhip the Dead*. The » *Dæmones* of the *Heathens* were their *dead Hero's*, » whom they made *Divi* by their *Apotheoſis*, as the » *Pope* do's *Saints* by a *Canonization*. pag. 120.

L. Now, Sr, I muſt own, your Parallel is moſt admirable. For, as the *Heathens* made *Gods* of their *dead Hero's*, who were moſt *wicked Wretches*, and *offer'd Sacrifice* to 'em; juſt ſo the *Pope* or *Church of Rome* declares Men eminent for the *Holineſs* of their Lives to be *Saints*, and deſires a *Part* in their *Prayers*; which is juſt as good a *Parallel*, as is contain'd in the two following Verſes.

Even as in a Banquet there be many Diſhes,
Even ſo your Doublet be too ſhort for your Breeches.

Pray, Sr, leave off this prophane Trifling, and begin to ſpeak Senſe.

» *G.* But it is too groſs to put it upon the *Hea-* » *thens* that they thought every one of thoſe *Gods*, » whom they made, was the *Supreme God*, who made » themſelves. *pag.* 120.

L. Well, Sr! And who ever told you they did? However, tho they did not think them all to be *ſupreme Gods*, yet they offer'd *Sacrifice* to them as much as to their *Supreme Jupiter*.

» *G.* They own'd theſe to be *leſſer Gods*, and only » the *Virtues* and *Powers* of the *Great God*: and they » thought, that they honour'd the *Supreme God* the » more by Doing Honour to his *Subſtitutes*, and all » their *Worſhip* was ultimately referr'd to him, *ſo* » *that he only was Worſhipped in all their Gods and God-*

deſſes. For they made him King of all their Gods and « *Goddeſſes.* Aug. de Civ. Dei. L. 4. C. 9. and C. 11. « And the common Appellation given to *Jupiter* in « *Homer* is *the Father and King of Gods as well as Men.* « And he repreſents him as Commanding all the « other *Gods*, ſending them on his Errands, Calling « them to an Account, and ſometimes Chaſtizing « them. He was call'd *Magnus Deus*, the *Great God.* « And *Lucian* in his Dialogues brings in *Neptune* « making Suit to *Mercury*, that he might ſpeak with « *Jupiter.* pag. 120. 121. «

L. Sr, not only *Homer*, but all the *Heathen* Poets call *Jupiter* the *Father and King of Gods as well as Men*, and the *Romans* ſtiled him *Optimus Maximus*, the beſt and greateſt God. Which makes it plain, that *Jupiter* was the *ſupreme God* both of the *Greeks* and *Romans.* And ſince, according to what you now labour to prove, the *Heathens* worshipped the *one ſupreme and true God* (becauſe this is neceſſary to make good your Parallel) the Conſequence is manifeſt, that the *Jupiter* of the *Heathens* is according to your Doctrine the ſame as the *true God* of the *Chriſtians.* This Bishop *Stillingfleet* (of whom you have borrow'd your noble Parallel) taught firſt to the Shame and Scandal of Chriſtianity. But after Dr *Godwin's* ſolid Confutation of that ſcandalous Piece, I never thought he would have had a Follower. Is it then poſſible that Perſons, who pretend to be Miniſters of the Goſpel, ſhould maintain that the infamous *Jupiter* adored by the *Pagans* was the *true God!* For if he was the *true God* then, he is ſo ſtill; and by Conſequence it is no *Blaſphemy* to ſay, *I believe in* Jupiter *the Almighty Creator of Heaven and Earth, and in Jeſus-Chriſt his only Son.* And if any one asks me *what Jupiter* I mean? I may ſafely anſwer, *Homer's* Jupiter; *that very* Jupiter, *whom the Pagans adored.*

This shews how Shocking and Offensive to *Christian Ears* the Consequences are, which follow from your Maintaining that the *Jupiter* of the *Heathens* was the *true supreme God.*

I am sure at least the *primitive Christians* were not of your Mind. For thousands of them lost their Lives, because they refused to *Worship* the *Jupiter* of the *Heathens*, and they never refused to *Worship* the *true God.* Nay *Origen* tells us in plain Terms, that he was not the *true God*, but a *Devil. We are ready*, says he, *to undergo any Torments rather than confess* Jupiter *to be God. For we do not believe* Jupiter *and* Sabaoth *to be the same, neither indeed to be any God at all, but a* Devil, *who is delighted with the Name of* Jupiter; *an Enemy to Men and God.* L. 5. contra Celsum. pag. 487. This, Sr, breaks the very Neck of your fine *Parallel*, and so you may go on, if you please.

» *G.* We have sufficient Testimony in *Scripture* » of the *Heathens* Acknowledging *the one Supreme* » *and true God. Nebucadnezzar* calls him *God of Gods*, » and *Lord of Kings*, Dan. 2. ℣. 47. pag. 121.

L. But in the very same Verse he calls him *Daniel's God*, which is a sufficient *innuendo*, that even then he neither *Acknowledg'd* nor *Worshipped* him as his own God. I add, that this Profession of the true God was only the Effect of a sudden Transport of Admiration in Regard of *Daniel's* wonderful Discovery and Interpretation of *Nebuchadnezzar's* Dream: But it made no real Change either in his belief or Practice. For the very next Chapter contains a Relation of the famous *golden Statue* or *Idol* set up by him with a positive Command, that all should adore it. Nay to shew plainly that he did not believe the *true God*, when *Daniel's* three Companions were brought before him, and accused of refusing to adore

his Statue, he ſpoke thus inſultingly to them, *and who is that God, that ſhall deliver you out of my Hands?* Dan. 3. ℣. 15.

G. But he calls him afterwards *the moſt high God.* « ℣. 26. «

L. He do's ſo. But it was like his former Profeſſion, that is, a ſudden Tranſport, when he ſaw Daniel's three Companions deliver'd by him in a moſt wonderful Manner out of the fiery Furnace.

G. He ſays, *I bleſſed the moſt High, and I praiſed* « *and honour'd him, that liveth for ever and ever, whoſe* « *Dominion is an everlaſting Dominion, and his Kingdom* « *from Generation to Generation. And all the Inhabitants* « *of the Earth are reputed as Nothing: And he do's ac-* « *cording to his Will in the Army of Heaven, and among* « *the Inhabitants of the Earth, and no Man can ſtay his* « *Hand, or ſay unto him, what doeſt thou?* Dan. 4. ℣. « 34. 35. pag. 121. 122. «

L. This indeed looks like a ſincere Profeſſion of *the true God.* But when was it, that *Nebuchadnezzar* made this Profeſſion? It was after *God* had humbled him in a ſtrange Manner, and then reſtored him to his Kingdom according to *Daniel's* Prediction. However it is ſtill a Queſtion diſputed, whether this made ſuch a laſting Impreſſion upon him, as to reclaim him entirely from *Idolatry.* The Scripture no where aſſures us of it. Nor do we find in him the neceſſary Marks of a ſincere Converſion: ſince he neither releaſed the People of God from their unjuſt Captivity, nor reſtored the ſacred Veſſels, he had carried away in the Pillage of the Temple of *Jeruſalem*: as he muſt have done, if he had been truly converted to God.

G. Cyrus alſo calls him *the Lord God of Heaven.* « Ezr. 1. ℣. 2. And *Darius* the ſame in as high Ex- « preſſions, as any Chriſtian could uſe, *the living God* «

is and ſtedfaſt for ever: and his Kingdom that, which is ſhall not be deſtroy'd, and his Dominion ſhall be even to unto the End, &c. Dan. 6. ℣. 26. pag. 122.

L. Sr, the *Heathens*, who held the Plurality of Gods, could by Fits and Starts give thoſe Titles to the *true one*, without Forſaking their *falſe Gods*, or Changing their Worſhip. Therefore as to *Cyrus*, tho he calls him *the Lord God of Heaven* in the *ſecond Verſe*, he plainly diſtinguiſhes him in the *third* from the *God*, he Worſhipp'd himſelf. *Who is there*, ſays he, *among you of all his People?* His God *be with him and let him go up to* Jeruſalem, *which is in* Judah, *and build the Houſe of the* Lord God of Israel. *He is the God*, which is in Jerusalem. *Cyrus* therefore did not regard him as the *God* of *Babilon*.

But as to your Quotation from the 6th Chapter of *Daniel*, 'tis the very Chapter I ſhould chooſe in the whole *Bible* to prove that the *Heathens* did not *Acknowledge* or *Worſhip* the *true God*. *Daniel's* miraculous Preſervation from the *Lions* is the principal Subject of it; and Almighty God, who deliver'd his Servant in ſo wonderful a Manner, is call'd throughout the whole Chapter *the God of Daniel*, to diſtinguiſh him from the *God* of the *Babilonians*. *Firſt* ℣. 5. *then ſaid theſe Men, we ſhall not find any Occaſion againſt this* Daniel, *except we find it againſt him concerning the Law of* his God.

2*dly*, ℣. 11. *Then theſe Men aſſembled, and found* Daniel *Praying, and Making Supplications before* his God.

3*dly*, it tells us, that when *Daniel* was caſt into the Den of the Lions, *the King ſpake and ſaid unto* Daniel, thy God, *whom thou ſerveſt continually, will deliver thee*, ℣. 16. and

4*thly*, that the King coming early next Morning to the Den *cry'd with a lamentable Voice*, O Daniel

Servant of the Living God, is THY GOD, *whom thou ſerveſt continually, able to deliver thee from the Lions?* ℣. 20. *then ſaid* Daniel *unto the King, O King live for ever,* MY GOD *has ſent his Angel, &c.* ℣. 21. 22.

Who ſees not here, that *Daniel's God* is deſign'dly mark'd out as *diſtinguiſh'd* from the *God* of *Darius* and the *Babilonians?* Nay in the very *Edict*, wherein the *high Expreſſions* you ſpeak of are found, *Darius* calls him the God of *Daniel*. So that thoſe *high Expreſſions* were indeed the Fruits of a ſudden Tranſport of Joy for *Daniel's* Deliverance, but had no Effect as to any *Change of Worſhip*. And 'tis very remarkable, that by that Edict *Darius* do's not command his Subjects to *Worſhip*, but only *to tremble and fear before the God of Daniel*. ℣. 26. So that whilſt that Prince honour'd the *true God* in his *Edict*, both he and the People continued their *Worſhip of Idols* in their *Temples*.

G. My Lord, they did not think it inconſiſtent « to acknowledge *one God* above all, and yet to ſup- « poſe that every Nation had it's own *God* or *Gods* « in Subordination to the *ſupreme God*, and as *De-* « *puties* under him. This was their Notion. And they « ſuppoſed that *Judea* had it's own *tutelar God*, as « well as other Countries. Therefore the King of « *Aſſyria* having conquer'd it, ſent to teach his Peo- « ple, who went thither, the *Manner of the God of* « *the Land*, to appeaſe his *Wrath*, who had plagued « them with *Lions*. 2. Kings 17. ℣. 26. 27. 33. But yet « they forſook not their own Gods, for it is ſaid, « *they fear'd the Lord, and ſerved their own Gods*. And « they allow'd the ſame Liberty to the *Jews*, who « were not required in any of their Captivities to « renounce their own *God*; but only to worſhip the « *Gods* of the *Nations* where they lived. And of theſe « *tutelar Gods*, they ſuppoſed one might be ſtronger «

» or more powerful than another, and therefore they » would boaſt of their *Gods* one Country againſt an- » other. Thus ſaid *Senacherib*. *who are they among all* » *the Gods of the Countries, that has deliver'd their* » *Country out of my Hand, that the Lord* (the tutelar » *God of Judea*) *ſhould deliver Jeruſalem out of my* » *Hand? Where are the Gods of Hamath, and of Ar-* » *pad, &c.* 2. Kings c. 18. ℣. 34. 35. When *Moſes* » and *Aaron* told *Pharaoh* that the *God* of the *He-* » *brews* had met with them, he was not offended » that they had another *God* beſides thoſe which » were worshipped in *Egypt*. he took it as a Thing » granted, that every *People* had their own tutelar » *God*.

» This then was the Difference between the *Jews* » and *Gentiles*; the *Gentiles* thought it lawful to wor- » ship the *tutelar God* of any *Country*, but ſtill in » Subordination to the *moſt high God*, as has been » ſhew'd: on the other hand the *Jews* were obliged » to Worship the *Lord God*, the *ſupreme God*, and » *him only*, and they were forbid to worship any of » the *Gods* of the *Nations*.

» But this Sin they often fell into, they Wor- » ſhipped theſe *Gods*, but ſtill in Conjunction with » the *Lord* their *God*; and it is ſaid, *they did Wor-* » *ſhip, and ſwear by the Lord and ſwear by Malcham.* » Zeph. 1. ℣. 5. But *Samuel* told them, *if ye return* » *unto the Lord, with all your Hearts, then put away* » *the ſtrange Gods and Aſhtaroth from amongſt you*—— » *and ſerve him only*—*then they did put away Baalim* » *and Aſhtaroth, and ſerved the Lord only.* 1. Sam. 7. » ℣ 3. 4. pag. 122. 125.

L. Sr, what you ſaid firſt concerning the King of *Aſſyria* ſending to teach his People in *Samaria* the *Manner of the God of the Land*, is a good Proof that the *Aſſyrians* before they had taken *Samaria* were utter

utter Strangers to the Worship of the *true God*, and in all Probability would have continued so, had it not been for fear of the Lions. But, to be deliver'd from that Plague, they sent for a Jewish Priest *to teach them the Manner of the God of the Land*: And if *Beelzebub* had been the *God of the Land*, they would have done the same. 'Tis true, after that they model'd their Religion into a Mixture of *Judaism*, and *Idolatry*, and worshipped *God* jointly with their *Idols*, as the *Israelites* following the wicked Example of *Jeroboam* had done before them. But what is all this to the Purpose? Do's it follow hence, that the *Heathens* worshipped their *false Gods* with Subordination to the *supreme true God*, as you have most falsly asserted? Or do's it follow, that *Jupiter*, the supreme God of the *Greeks* and *Romans*; or *Baal*, the supreme God of the *Persians*; or *Osyris*, the supreme God of the *Egyptians*, was the same *true God* whom *Christians* adore; which is the scandalous Point you chiefly drive at? Sr, the *Heathen* Idolatry consisted precisely, not in their *joining* the *Worship* of *false Gods* with that of the *true one*, but in their Worshipping *many false Gods*, one of which they call'd *Supreme*: Yet tho the others were call'd *Inferiour* or *lesser Gods*, they regarded them absolutely as *Gods*, and in many Things wholly *independent*; because they thought they could do either *Good* or *Mischief* by their *own Power*; and therefore they endeavour'd to render them favourable by *Sacrifices*; for they *sacrificed* as absolutely to their *lesser Gods*, as to their *mighty Jove*. The *Idolatry* of the *Jews* indeed, when they fell into it, was their *joining* the *Worship* of *false Gods* with that of the *true one*, and therefore they are truly said *to have forsaken the Lord*; because there is but *one true God*; and he who serves not *him alone*, do's not serve him *at all*.

» *G.* It is call'd *Forſaking the Lord*, when we will » not obey his Commandements, but worship him » otherwiſe than he has required, and *join* others » with him, which he has forbidden. *pag.* 124.

L. Yes, Sr, when we join other *Gods* or *Idols* with him. But I hope he has not forbid us to *praiſe him in his Saints*, or to honour thoſe upon Earth, whom he himſelf honours in Heaven.

» *G.* He ſaid, *the Houſe of Iſrael is eſtranged from* » *me, ſeparated from me by their Idols: yet come and en-* » *quire of a Prophet concerning me.* Ezek. 14. ℣. 5. 7. » and again, *when they had ſlain their Children to their* » *Idols, then they came the ſame Day into my Sanctuary.* » C. 23. ℣. 39. And he ſays to them, *will you burn* » *Incenſe unto Baal, and walk after other Gods, and* » *come and ſtand before me in this Houſe, which is call'd* » *by my Name?* Jer. 7. ℣. 4. It is ſaid, *they fear'd the* » *Lord, and ſerved their own Gods after the Manner of* » *the Nations.* But it immediatly follows, *they fear* » *not the Lord, becauſe they do not after his Statutes,* » wherein he commanded them *not to fear other Gods.* » And again, *they fear'd the Lord, and ſerved their* » *graven Images.* 2. Kings C. 17. ℣. 33. 34. 41. Yet » this was Departing from the Fear of the *Lord*, but » not a downright Denial of the *Supreme God*, or » Throwing him off from being any more their *God*, » and Taking any *other God* in his Room as the *Su-* » *preme God.* No, but it was Taking *other Gods* with » him, of which he ſays, *O do not this abominable* » *Thing, which I hate.* Jer. 44. ℣. 4. pag. 124.

L. Sr, I obſerve you are always very prodigal of your *Scripture-texts*, when you have a Thing to prove, which is plain and undeniable. For who was ever ſo ignorant as to deny that the *Jews* join'd the *Worſhip* of *Idols* with that of the *true God*? But what do you infer from it?

G. This was the first Sin, against which *God* « took Care to guard in the *first Commandement*, *thou* « *shalt have none other Gods before me*, or with me. « Exod. 20. v. 3. 23. And for the Distinction that « the Worship of *Inferiour Gods*, or *Ministers of* « *God* is not here forbidden, we say, *where the Law* « *does not distinguish*, *we must not*. For there is no « *Law*, but may be *distinguish'd away*. And this is « exactly the same Notion the *Heathens* had of their « *Daemons*. And the Worshipping of these or Fea- « ring them, is literally what we call *Superstition*. It « is a *Means of Grace*, which *God* has not appointed. « *pag.* 125. «

L. What, Sr! Is the *Worship* of *Demons* or *evil Spirits* barely *Superstition*, and not *Idolatry*! Or do we make the *Worship* of *Daemons* a *Means of Grace*! This is Bidding Defiance to all Shame. But it is not the only impudent Calumny insinuated in this Piece. You tell me first, *that joining the Worship of other Gods* (Meaning the *lesser Gods* of the *Heathens*) *with that of the true God is the Sin*, *against which God took Care to guard us in the first Commandement*. And do we deny it? On the Contrary I assure you, Sr, (tho I know you will be sorry to hear it) our *Divines* teach, that it forbids the *Worship* of *all false Gods* whatsoever, that is, not only of those, whom the *Heathens* call'd *inferiour Gods*, but also of your *Darling great God Jupiter*, for whom you are so *Religiously* concern'd, as not to suffer him to come within the Prohibition of the *first Commandement*. This indeed is a *Scandalous Distinction*, which was wholly unknown to the *Primitive Christians*, who rather chose to lose their Lives than worship *Jupiter*, as I have already shew'd.

But as to the *Distinction*, you tacitly father upon us, viz. *that the Worship of inferiour Gods is not forbid-*

den in the first Commandement. Pray, Sr, in what *Catholick* Author do you find this *Distinction?* Our *Divines* teach indeed with all the *Ancient Fathers* that a *Relative Honour* is due to *God's Saints* and *Angels*, and that this is no more forbid by the *first Commandement*, than Honouring *God's Servants* upon Earth. But is this the same as Teaching *that the Worship of Demons*, or *Inferiour Gods is not forbid by that Commandement?* The Commandement says, *thou shall't have none other Gods before me or with me.* But it do's not say, *thou shall't not honour the Friends and Servants of God.*

You have indeed been very craftily cautious, *first*, to use the Word *Worship*; because it is an *ambiguous* Word, and is promiscuously used to signify either *Divine*, or only an *inferiour* or *Relative Honour*. And *2dly*, by another cunning Slight you make *Inferiour Gods*, and *Ministers of God* to be *Synonimous Terms*. Now I think the *Saints* and *Angels* are truly *Ministers of God*, but not in the Number of the *lesser Gods* of the *Heathens*, that are *forbid* in the *first Commandement*. For if they be, your *own Church*, which keeps *one Day* for all the *Saints in general*, and *another* for St *Michael* and all *Angels*, is regularly twice a Year guilty of a *Breach* of *that Commandement:* unless you have the Confidence to say, that *keeping solemn Days* in *Memory* of the *Saints* and *Angels* is not *Honouring* them in any Manner.

But I presume, Sr, you have now done with your *noble Parallel*, which I think is one of the most notorious Pieces of *wilful* and *premeditated Slander*, that ever was maintain'd seriously. I shall add a few Remarks to what I have already said, to justify this Censure. It has been your Business to make us appear as *rank Idolaters* as the *Heathens* ever were. And who would have expected any Thing less for Proof

of this *enormous Accusation*, than a full and convincing Evidence at least of one of these three Points; viz. either that *Papists* do not *acknowledge* and *Worship* the *true God*, or that they *join* with it the *Worship* of *false Gods*, as the *Jews* did; or that they *offer Sacrifice*, and pay *Divine Honours* to the *Saints* and *Angels*. For, whoever is justly accused of *Idolatry*, must be proved guilty of one of these three Things.

Now, if you had but attempted to prove any one of these three Articles in *plain* and *express* Terms, all the World would have cry'd out Shame upon you, because the *Calumny* would have been too Gross and barefaced. And this you were sensible of. Therefore, to give some plausible colour to your *Parallel*, you have made Use of all the little sinister tricks, that a good stock of *Wit*, but a much greater of *Malice* and *Insincerity* could suggest to you.

First, it being notoriously known, that *Papists* worship the *true God*, you could not possibly attack them on that Side. Therefore, to lay the Foundation of your *Parallel*, and make them appear *no better* than *Heathens* even in that *Essential Point*, you have labour'd with all your Strengh to prove, that the *Heathens* themselves worshipped the *same true God*, as *Christians* now do. Tho it be a flat Contradiction not only to the general Notion of Mankind, but to innumerable *Texts* of holy *Scripture*.

2*dly*, because it is an undeniable Truth, that *Papists* do not regard the *Saints* as *Gods*, but only as the *Servants* of the *true God*, you had no other Way to bring them upon the *Level* with *Heathens*, than by Maintaining that all their *lesser Gods*, were no more in their Opinion than the *Powers* or *Ministers* of the *true supreme God*; tho it be certain, they regarded them all as *independent* in many Things as to their *Power* of Doing either *Good* or *Mischief*; and 'tis no-

toriouſly known, that they *ſacrificed* to their *leſſer Gods* as well as to *Jupiter*; and *Sacrifice* is only offer'd to ſuch as are properly call'd and eſteem'd *Gods*.

But leaſt our not Sacrificing to *Saints* and *Angels* ſhould ſpoil the Beauty of your *Parallel*, you took timely Care to call St *Auſtin* to your Aſſiſtance by a very dexterous and ſeaſonable *Falſification* of his Words. For inſtead of his Saying, *that they, who proudly require* SACRIFICE *to be offerr'd to them, and will be* WORSHIPPED AS GODS *are evil and proud Spirits*, you only make him ſay, *that they muſt be evil Spirits, becauſe they required* WORSHIP *from Men*: and the Reaſon, which induced you to this Trick of *Legerdemain* is very plain; becauſe the Word *Sacrifice* ſpoils all, in Determining the *Manner of Worſhip*, which St *Auſtin* ſays is a ſure Mark of their being *Evil Spirits*, who require it; whereas the Word *Worſhip* being *Equivocal*, St *Auſtin's* Meaning is left *doubtful*; and the Advantage you make of it is to inſinuate, that even the *inferiour Honour* we pay to *Saints* and *Angels*, which may be call'd *Worſhip*, was condemn'd by that *Father*.

This, Sr, plainly ſhews, how dear it ſometimes coſts Men to carry on an unjuſt Cauſe. *Truth*, *Honour*, *Conſcience*, *Reaſon*, *common Senſe*, all muſt be ſacrificed to ſupport it. And truly, Sr, I wish you may not have been at the Expence of all theſe to prove *Papiſts Idolaters*. This I am ſure of, that unleſs you can either prove, that *Saints* and *Angels* are *evil Spirits*, or that *Deſiring their Prayers* is giving them *Divine Worſhip*, you may as eaſily prove *White* to be *Black*, as diſcover the leaſt Shadow of *Idolatry* in our Doctrine of the *Invocation of Saints*.

§. 12.

Of ſuppoſititious Saints.

G. MY Lord, in your *Catalogue* of *Saints* there are many *Suppoſititious* ones to be found. What think you of the 7 *Sleepers*, who ſlept 362 Years, and thought it but one Night? *pag.* 125.

L. Sr, the 7 *Sleepers* are the 7 Martyrs of *Epheſus*, who when they were put to Death *ſlept in the Lord* like St *Stephen*. Act 7. ℣. 60. That is, died happily; and this is all I believe of their *Sleeping*. The reſt has been added by the fabulous *Greeks*, whoſe Relations we give as little Credit to as you yourſelves.

G. What think you of the eleven thouſand *Engliſh Virgins*, all Martyr'd together at *Cologne*, and the fine Legend told of them? *pag.* 125.

L. Sr, I find Nothing of eleven Thouſand Virgins in our *Miſſals*; But that St *Urſula* with her *Companions* ſuffer'd Martyrdom is no Fable. This I believe, and no more.

G. What do you think of St *George's* killing the *Dragon*, and Reſcuing the *King's Daughter*? As true as our Ballad of the *Dragon* of *Wantley*? pag. 125.

L. Sr, I join Iſſue with you, and the *two Dragons* may go together, if you pleaſe. But is this a good Argument, *St George neither kill'd the Dragon, nor reſcued the King's Daughter, therefore there is no ſuch Saint?* Nay if *fabulous Legends* muſt deprive *Saints* of their *real Being*, we ſhall be in Danger of Loſing the *Apoſtles* as well as ſome other Saints, who cannot be reſponſable for *Fables* told of them any more than the *Apoſtles*, of whom many *fabulous Stories* were handed about even in the firſt Age. One of the Authors

of thoſe Stories, a *Prieſt*, was degraded by St *John* the *Evangeliſt*.

» *G.* My Lord, as ridiculous as theſe Stories are, » yet there are *Days* kept for all theſe, and *Offices* » made for them with Prayers to *them*, and to *God*, » that we may be ſaved by *theſe* their *Merits*. pag. » 125.

L. What, Sr! By St *George's Merits* for *killing the Dragon!* There is indeed an *Office* of him; but I don't remember, there is any *Commemoration* in it either of the *Dragon*, or of the *King's Daughter* being reſcued by him.

» *G.* There are Multitudes of the like; which » you will find even to a Surfeit in the *Devotions of* » *the Roman Church* with their *Breviaries*, *Miſſals*, *Le-* » *gends*, and *Authors* quoted at large. *pag.* 125. 126.

L. To a *Surfeit* indeed in that *ſhameful Libel*; But the Author's Quotations are many Times full as *honeſt* and *fair*, as your's from St *Auſtin* upon the 96 Pſalm.

» *G.* And can theſe Prayers be in *Faith* to Per- » ſons, that never were in Being? And for the *Me-* » *rit* of Actions, that never were done? This is a » *Means of Grace* of your own Invention indeed! *pag.* » 126.

L. Sr; a Man muſt be very incredulous, to pretend there never were ſuch Perſons in *Being* as the *ſeven Martyrs* of *Epheſus*, St *Urſula* with her Companions, and St *George* the ancient *Patron* of *England*, who are the *Saints* you have particularly cull'd out to paſs your jeſts upon: But ſince they were once *in Being*, I hope they are ſo ſtill, and we may beg *in Faith*, that is, *with a ſafe Conſcience* the Bleſſings of God through their *Interceſſion*, to which the *Merits* and *Holineſs* of their paſt Lives give doubtleſs a Value. But as to the *Merit of Actions*, *that never were done*,

dom, I have not yet ſeen a Prayer, for Example, to beg any Favour of God in Conſideration of St *George's killing the Dragon*, or *Reſcuing the fair Lady out of it's Jaws*. And therefore your Saying, *this is a Means of Grace of our own Invention*, is ſuch a Piece of inſipid Nonſenſe, that I bluſh to repeat it.

G. Beſides what I have already ſaid, many have been *canoniz'd* for *notorious Crimes*, as your St *Thomas Becket* of *Canterbury*, whoſe Merit was, that he would exempt all *Eccleſiaſticks* from the *ſecular* Power, tho even in *Civil* or *Criminal* Cauſes; which was call'd Aſſerting the *Liberties of the holy Church*, and it is fully aſſerted in the *Bulla Cœnæ*. But notwithſtanding all theſe Authorities it is a wicked Principle, and diſſolves all *Civil* Government: it exempts from the *King's* Obedience the *firſt* of the *three Eſtates* of the Realm, which has or ought to have the greateſt Influence upon the People, and transferrs their *Allegiance* to another *Sovereign*, which is the higheſt *Treaſon* by the Laws of all well-govern'd Nations as well as by the *Laws* of *God*. Yet for Aſſerting this *Becket* was *canoniz'd*; and for not giving Way to it, the *King* was *whipped* by the *Monks* of *Canterbury*, to which he was forced to ſubmit in thoſe Times of *Papal* Supremacy.

Such another was the laſt Year's *Saint* Pope *Pius V.* the great aſſertor, and laſt Practicer of the *Power* of the *Pope* to *depoſe Princes*, and who broke the Communion of the *Church of England*. p. 126.

L. Sr, I have already anſwer'd your Objection concerning Pope *Pius V.* (1. Part. §. 53.) againſt whom I perceive you have a particular Spleen, becauſe he *excommunicated* your *Virgin-Queen*, the *Foundreſs*, and firſt *Shee-Pope* of your *Church*. But your Saying, *that many have been Canoniz'd for Notorious*

Crimes is a moſt *Notorious Calumny*, and more Becoming the *Devil*, who is the profeſs'd Enemy of *God's Saints*, than a *Chriſtian Divine*.

You inſtance in St *Thomas of Canterbury*, of whom I have already ſpoken (1. Part. §. 43.) and juſtified his ſtanding up for the *Ancient Liberties* of the *Church*, ibid. You ſay, *his Merit was, that he would exempt all Eccleſiaſticks from the Secular Power.* Sr, *his Merit* was his *conſtant Holineſs of Life*, his *Paſtoral Zeal*, and *invincible Patience* in Suffering the Perſecutions of his Enemies. *His Merit* was, that he would not *betray his Conſcience* to comply with his *Prince*; that he would not leave the *Church*, wherewith God had entruſted him, in a *worſe Condition* than he had found it; nor yield up it's *Liberties* to the *Secular Power*, as an unworthy *Succeſſor* of his, your firſt *Proteſtant Arch-Biſhop Cranmer* did afterwards. This I ſay, was his merit, which you call a *notorious Crime*; and being aſſaſinated (tho without the King's Orders) he had both *God*, and the *King* Witneſſes of his *Innocence*.

What you add, viz. *that the King was whipped by the Monks of Canterbury; to which he was forced to ſubmit in thoſe Times of Papal Supremacy*, is falſe as to his *being forced* to it. He ſubmitted indeed like another *Theodoſius* to the Penance enjoin'd him by the *Pope's Legate*; but his *Whipping* was no Part of it. This he underwent voluntarily three Years after, when he made a *Pilgrimage* to St *Thomas's* Tomb to beg his *Prayers* againſt the *French*, the *Scots*, and his own *rebellious Son*. And God was pleaſed to manifeſt in a ſingular Manner how acceptable this *Humiliation* was to him. For upon the very Day that he layd proſtrate at St *Thomas's* Tomb, the *King* of *Scots* was taken Priſoner. Soon after he raiſed the Siege of *Roüen*, which his *Son* and the *French King* attack'd, and in a ſhort Time found himſelf quiet Poſſeſſor of his

Kingdom. All these Particulars you will find in the learned *Du Pin.* Cent. 12. p. 132. of whose Veracity I know you have a great Opinion.

§. 15.

Of Devotion to the blessed Virgin.

G. THere is one Saint truly so, of whom I have reserved to speak in this Place, because of the Excesses in your Church in their Devotions to her bordering even upon *Blasphemy* to any common Ear. *pag.* 127.

L. Now indeed you startle me. I hope however we do not make a *Goddess* of her, nor offer *Sacrifice* to her: tho we endeavour to pay her all the Honour due to her as *Mother of God.*

G. No less than a canoniz'd Person, St *Bonaventure* has publish'd what he calls the *Psalter* of the *blessed Virgin Mary*, wherein every one of the 150 Psalms as likewise the *te Deum*, and other most solemn Adorations of God are all turn'd to the *Virgin Mary.* pag. 127.

L. Sr, I answer *first*, that the *Psalter* attributed to St *Bonaventure* is not his. For neither *Trithemius* nor *Gesnerus* place it amongst his Works. Nor is it probable a Man of St *Bonaventure's* Judgment and Learning should be the Author of such an indiscreet Piece. I answer *2ly*, that it is in the Catalogue of forbidden Books, and is therefore far from being a Part of the Devotions of the *Church of Rome.* So pray go on.

G. Rosaries, and Books of Devotions to her are so many———

L. That's very true, Sr.

G. Here is one translated into *English* for the

» Uſe of the *Roman Catholicks* here, intitled, *the De-*
» *votion of Bondage, or the Practice of perfectly Conſe-*
» *crating ourſelves to the Service of the Bleſſed Virgin,*
» *permiſſu Superiorum* 1632. it is licenſed, and highly
» recommended both to Clergy and People by the
» *Bishop of St Omers* with ſeveral Indulgences gran-
» ted to thoſe, who ſhall devoutly make Uſe of it.
» Wherein we offer up ourſelves both Souls and
» Bodies as *Bondſlaves* to the *bleſſed Virgin*. Among
» the high Prerogatives of the *bleſſed Virgin* you will
» find this the ſixth pag. 32. *the ſovereign Dominion*
» *that was given her not only over the World, but over*
» *the Creator of the World*. This indeed might well
» ground this Petition made to her, *jure Matris im-*
» *pera filio*, that is, *by the Right of a Mother command*
» *your Son*. And her being call'd the *Mother of the whole*
» *Trinity* in the *Miſſal. Polon.* fol. 237. pag. 127.

L. Sr, it is the firſt Time I ever heard of *Miſſal. Polon.* But this I am ſure of, that whoever ſtiles the *Virgin Mary* the *Mother of the whole Trinity*, and means what he ſays, is a rank *Heretick*; and if he ſhould teach this Doctrine at *Rome*, he would either have a Mad-houſe, or the Priſon of the Inquiſition aſſign'd him for his Lodging.

As to the Book entitled *the Devotion of Bondage*, *&c.* Whatever Approbation it had at it's firſt coming Forth, it has been condemn'd many Years ago. And ſo it is impertinent to reproach us with it. I heartily wish your Church took the ſame Care to condemn and ſuppreſs all the *ſcandalous*, *prophane*, and *Atheiſtical* Books, that are publickly printed in *London*, and ſuffer'd to be in the Hands of every Body.

But as to thoſe Words, *by the Right of a Mother command your Son*, tho I allow the Expreſſion to be too hyperbolical, they are capable of a fair and Or-

thodox Conſtruction, if they meet with an unprejudiced Reader. For there are even in Scripture ſome Expreſſions, which carry with them the ſame Vehemence, and in Appearance the ſame hyperbolical Exceſs. As, when it is ſaid, that *Joſue ſpoke to our Lord, and the Sun ſtood ſtill, God* OBEYING *the Voice of a Man.* Joſ. 10. ℣. 12. 14. and when our Saviour ſays of himſelf, that *in Heaven he will make his Servants ſit down at Meat, and will* SERVE *them.* Luke 12. ℣. 37. For, as the former of theſe Expreſſions do's not ſignify a real *Obedience* in God to the Voice of a Man, but his Readineſs to hear the Prayers of thoſe that fear him, nor the latter that Chriſt will realy *ſerve* the Elect at Table, but only expreſſes his tenderneſs for them, and the Care he will take to complete their joy and Happineſs; ſo theſe Words, *by the Right of a Mother command your Son*, do not ſignify that ſhe ſhould really *command* him, as ſhe did when he was ſubject to her upon Earth, but that ſhe will uſe that Intereſt with him in our Behalf, which as a Mother ſhe has with him above all other Saints.

G. My Lord, in the *Primer*, or Office of the « *bleſſed Virgin* printed in *Engliſh* 1699. (and in the « Expoſition before it's ſaid to be of great Antiqui- « ty, and compoſed by the Church directed by the « Holy Ghoſt) you will find many Prayers to her « not only of *Interceſſion* or *Praying for us*, but to « grant *Grace*, *Pardon of Sins*, and *eternal Life* in as « full and poſitive Terms, as could be ask'd of God « himſelf. See the Hymn, *memento rerum Conditor.* « pag. 34. and *Ave Maris ſtella*, pag. 53. And the « Prayer to her, pag. 59. *under thy Aid — ſub tuum* « *præſidium*, which is taken out of the *Roman Ponti-* « *fical* in the Office for the Conſecrating an Image « of the *B. Virgin*, where you pray for Aid directly «

without Mentioning any *Interceſſion*. pag. 127. 128.

L. Sr, the *Primer* is certainly a Prayer-book of great Authority amongſt us, and I ſtand to every Thing you can find in it. *Firſt*, you diſlike the Hymn, *memento rerum Conditor*. I preſume chiefly becauſe it ſtiles the *B. Virgin* the *Mother of Grace*. And is not ſhe the *Mother of Grace*, who brought forth Chriſt the Fountain of all Grace? *2ly*, you carp at the *ave Maris ſtella*, and the Anthem, *ſub tuum Præſidium*. But Sr, one Verſe of the *Ave Maris ſtella* is this, *bona cuncta poſce*, *ask all good Things for us*, which fully explains the meaning of all the reſt. And the Anthem, *ſub tuum Præſidium* is generally concluded with this Verſicle, *ora pro nobis*, *pray for us*. But ſuppoſe the Word *pray* or *intercede* be not always expreſs'd, may not the Church be allow'd to uſe her own way of Speaking as well as other Societies of Men, eſpecially when her Meaning is as well known as the Alphebet?

G. Pray, My Lord, whence muſt the People take the Senſe of their Prayers, but from the Signification of the Words?

L. But muſt the Signification of thoſe Words be always interpreted by the Rules of *Grammer*? I think our *Councils* and *Catechiſms* are better Interpreters of the Senſe of our publick Prayers, than *William Lilly* or *Littleton's Dictionary*. When the Scripture ſpeaks thus; *I ſay, ye are Gods*. Pſal. 81. or tells us, *that God obey'd the Voice of a Man*, a Grammarian will perhaps cry out *Blaſphemy!* But a *Divine* will give him a civil Reprimand, and tell him he muſt conſult *Divines* and not *Pedants* for the true Meaning of *Scriptural Phraſes*. And ſo it is with the Language of the Church in her *Prayers*. She is the ſole Interpreter of their true Senſe, and ſhe has ſufficiently declared, that in what Form ſoever her Prayers to Saints are expreſs'd,

she means no more than to implore their *Intercession* to the *Giver of all good Gifts*. So that when we desire the *blessed Virgin* to *help*, *comfort*, or *deliver us* from *Sin*, or bring us to *eternal Life*, the true Meaning is (and she knows it to be so) that we only desire her to obtain for us those Blessings of God through the *Mediation of Jesus-Christ*.

§. 14.

The Blessed Virgin *not put upon the Level with* Christ.

G. MY Lord, your *Church blesses* in the *Name* « of the *Virgin Mary*, which was never « done to any Creature. The *Priesthood* was ordain'd « by *God* to *bless in his Name*. No *Apostle* or *Angel* « ever *blessed* the *People* in *his own Name*. Deut. 10. 8. « But in this *Primer*, pag. 16. you will see the *Priest* « give the *Blessing* in these Words. *The Virgin Mary* « *with her pious Son bless us*, to which the *People* an- « swer, *Amen*. Here the principle Part is given to « the *Virgin*. Her *Son* only blesses *with* her, and she « is first named. But if she be not preferr'd, yet « she is here put upon the Level at least with her « Son, and *blesses* the *People* jointly with him. pag. « 128. «

L. Sr, I should not be surpriz'd to hear a *Grammarian* argue as you do. But I take it to be beneath a *Divine* to lay a Stress upon a meer *grammatical* Construction in a *theological* Dispute. When a Child, for Example, says, *bless me Father*; here not only the *principal Part* of *Blessing* is *literally* and *grammatically* given to the *Father*, but *God* is not so much as mention'd, and the *Father* alone is named. And will you be so weak, as to conclude from thence, that the Child's Father is *preferr'd* to, or put upon

the *Level* with *God*? If you be, Children themſelves will tell you, that when they ſay, *Father bleſs me*, they mean no more than to deſire their Father to *pray* to *God* to *bleſs* them; and ſo when we deſire the *Virgin Mary* to *bleſs us with her Son*, we only beg of her to obtain for us a *Bleſſing* of *God* through the *Mediation of Jeſus-Chriſt*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The Gentleman *after his laſt Words labours hard to prove, that the* Angel, *whom* Jacob *pray'd to* bleſs *his* Sons, *was not an* Angel, *but* Chriſt: *who (as he tells us) often appear'd before he* took Flesh. *I fancy indeed he will find but few of his Opinion. But it being a Point of no Conſequence is omitted, and the* Gentleman *go's on thus.*

» *G. Epiphanius* Hær. 78. 79. reckons the *Worſhip* » of the *Virgin Mary* (not then *ſo rank*) a- » mong the *Hereſies* under the Name of the *Collyri-* » *dians*, who offer'd *Cakes* to the *Moon* as the *Queen* » *of Heaven*, which is the ſame Name you now give » to the *Virgin*, and she is painted ſtanding upon the » *Moon* her *Repreſentative*. pag. 129.

L. What will not Prejudice prompt a Man to ſay! The *Collyridians* offer'd *Cakes* and *Flower* in *Sacrifice* to the *Queen of Heaven*, that is, *Worſhipped* her as a *Goddeſs*; and yet their Worſhip *was not ſo rank* as ours. And why ſo? Becauſe we ſtile the *Virgin Mary Queen of Heaven*, and she is painted *ſtanding* upon the *Moon*. Who will not be convinced by ſuch ſtrong Reaſons?

» *G. Epiphanius* obſerves, that our bleſſed *Lord* » foreſeeing the *Superſtition*, that would come into the

World

World on Account of his *Mother*, treated her « always at a Diſtance, never once call'd her *Mo-* « *ther*, no not upon the *Croſs*, or by any other Ap- « pellation, than that of *Woman*, and checking her « *Forwardneſs* ſaid unto her, *Woman, what have I to* « *do with thee.* John. 2. ℣. 4. She is as little named « as poſſible in the *Goſpels*, where *Chriſt* pronounces « a greater Bleſſing to thoſe that hear his Word, « than to the *Womb* that bare him. *Luke* 11. ℣. 28. « And she is not reckon'd among thoſe, who ſaw « him after his *Reſurrection.* She is but once named « in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, and that upon no other « Account, than that she with other Women con- « tinued in the Communion of the *Apoſtles* after the « *Aſcenſion* of our *Lord*, Act. 1. ℣. 14. But none of « her *Acts* or *Miracles* are recorded, tho Abundance « in the *Legends.* And she is not once named upon « any Account whatſoever in any of the *Epiſtles.* « Strange! that this should be ſo forgot, which « makes now ſo great a Part in the *Devotions* of the « *Church of Rome.* pag. 129, 130. «

L. Strange! do you ſay Sr? And is it not much more *Strange*, that a *Chriſtian Divine* should employ the very beſt of his Rhetorick to leſſen, and depre- ciate the *Bleſſed Mother of Chriſt!* For were I an ut- ter Stranger to the *Principles* of *Chriſtian Religion*, and should hear a *Chriſtian* ſet forth the *Bleſſed Virgin* as you have done, I should form no other Idea of her, than that she was ſome *deſpicable Creature*, whom *Chriſt* was ashamed to own for his *Mother*; whoſe *Forwardneſs*, as you call it, he was forced to *check:* whom he utterly neglected at his *Death*, and for whom neither the *Apoſtles* nor *Evangeliſts* had the leaſt *Regard.* This, Sr, is the Idea, which your Diſcourſe would form in any Man not guarded beforehand by the Principles of *Chriſtian Religion.*

'Tis true, the *Evangelists* mention no *tender Expressions* of our *Saviour* to his *blessed Mother*: neither do they mention any *tender Expressions* of *her's* to her *Son*, nor even that she felt any *Grief* at his *Death*. But I hope we must not conclude from thence, either that she had a *Heart* of *Stone*, or that these *Omissions* were intended by the *Holy Ghost* to prevent our being too tenderly affected towards our *Saviour's Passion*: which suffices to shew the Weakness of your chief Remark.

However, Sr, the *Scripture* is not so very *Silent* concerning the *Blessed Virgin*, as you represent it; unless the very first Chapter of St *Luke* be no Part of *Scripture*. For in that Chapter you will find the *whole Foundation*, on which our *Devotion* to the *Blessed Virgin* is built. What do you think of the *Angels* Salutation, *Hail, full of Grace, our Lord is with thee?* Luke 1. ℣. 28. which contains the sublimest Panygerick, that ever was made of a *pure Creature*. What do you think of the Words of *Elizabeth*, who *was fill'd with the Holy Ghost, and she spoke with a loud Voice, and said, Blessed art thou amongst Women, and blessed is the Fruit of thy Womb*. Luke 1. ℣. 41. 42. she spoke *with a loud Voice*, and was not afraid to be censured for Naming the *Mother* before the *Son*, which is one of your weighty Objections against the *Church of Rome*. Lastly, what do you think of the *Blessed Virgin's* own *Prophetick* Words, *for behold from henceforth all Generations shall call me blessed*. Luke 1. ℣. 48. which may be call'd a plain *Prediction* of the *Honour* and *Respect*, which the *Church* has paid her throughout all Ages. *Strange!* That our Blessed Lord *should foresee the Superstition* (as you call it) *which would come into the World on Account of his Mother*, and yet inspire his *Evangelists* to write things of her, which give us the *highest Idea* of her *Dignity*

and *Merits*, and are the whole Ground of that *Devotion*, which you pretend *Christ* intended to prevent.

G. But, My Lord, you take no Notice, that the Obſervations I have made relating to the *Virgin Mary*, and which you have reflected upon with ſo much Tartneſs, are not my own, but taken from Saint *Epiphanius*. Hær. 79.

L. Sr, you wrong St *Epiphanius*, not only in Miſrepreſenting the Drift of his Diſcourſe, but alſo by Adding to his Words, and Mixing your own *undecent Reflections* with his in ſuch a Manner, as to make them appear to be his. For pray, Sr, tell me where will you find any of theſe Reflections relating to the *Bleſſed Virgin* in Saint *Epiphanius*? viz. that *Chriſt call'd her Woman* TO CHECK HER FORWARDNESS? That *she is as little named as is poſſible in the Goſpels?* That our Saviour always treated her *at a Diſtance*. That *they, who hear the Word of God have greater Bleſſings pronounced to them than the Mother of Chriſt?* That *she is not reckon'd amongſt thoſe, who ſaw him after his Reſurrection*, and that *she is but once named in the Acts of the Apoſtles, and not once in the Epiſtles?*

Theſe, Sr, are all your own Obſervations, and they ſhew the profound Reſpect you have for the *Mother* of *Chriſt*; but not one of them is to be found in St *Epiphanius*, whoſe Words faithfully render'd are theſe. *Wherefore we are alſo precaution'd by the holy Goſpel, wherein Chriſt ſpeaks thus*, Woman, what is it to me and to thee? My Hour is not yet come. *John* 1. 4. *Where for this Reaſon he call'd her* Woman, *leaſt any one ſhould believe the Bleſſed Virgin to be of ſome more* Excellent Nature [viz. than the reſt of Womankind.] *Giving her, as it were, prophetically that Name to refute the Hereſies, and Schiſms, which he knew would in Aftertimes happen in the World: And leaſt any one through an exceſſive Opinion of the moſt holy Virgin ſhould be ad-*

dicted to the Dotage and Fooleries of that Hereſy. L. 3. T. 4. Hær. 79.

Now, Sr, the *Hereſy*, St *Epiphanius* treats of in the Place quoted, is that of certain *bigotted Women* of *Thrace* call'd *Collyridians*, who not only aſſumed to themſelves the *Prieſtly Office*, but made a *Goddeſs* of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, and *Worshipped* her with *Sacrifice:* Which *Madneſs* or *Dotage* he refutes at large, and then obſerves, that to prevent our Falling into this *Dotage*, viz. *of Believing the Bleſſed Virgin to be more than a* WOMAN, *and Worshipping her as a* GODDESS, Chriſt took Care to call her *Woman*, ſaying at the *Wedding* in *Cana* of *Galilee*, *quid mihi & tibi Mulier: nondum venit hora mea*: Woman, *what is it to me and to thee? My Hour is not yet come.* And is this the ſame as your unhandſome Reflection, viz. *that Chriſt foreſeeing the Superſtition, which would come into the World* [by which you mean what St *Epiphanius* never thought of] *always treated her* AT A DISTANCE, *and* CHECKING HER FORWARDNESS *ſaid unto her, Woman what have I to do with thee?*

But, Sr, our *Bleſſed Saviour* did not always *treat his Mother at a Diſtance*, as you pretend. For St *Luke* tells us expreſſly, that *he went down with his Father and Mother to Nazareth, and was ſubject unto them*, Luke 2. ℣. 51. That is to ſay, obey'd them, as dutiful Children do their Parents; which with your Leave, Sr, is not Treating them *at a Diſtance*. Nay at that very Time, when inſtead of Giving to the *Bleſſed Virgin* the tender Name of *Mother* he call'd her *Woman*, he had a Regard to her *Requeſt*, and upon her *Interceſſion* manifeſted himſelf by the *firſt Miracle*, he ever wrought. Which I think was Encouraging his *future Church* to have a *Confidence* in her *Prayers*.

» *G.* But there is an Honour of an extraordinary » Nature paid to her at the Head of all the *Saints* in

the Office of the *Maſs*; where, before the Conſe- « cration, the Elements are offer'd up to God in Me- « mory of the *Paſſion*, *Reſurrection*, and *Aſcenſion* of « *Jeſus-Chriſt*, and for the *Honour* of the Bleſſed *Vir-* « *gin Mary*, &c. *in honorem beatæ Mariæ ſemper Vir-* « *ginis*. Did Chriſt then *ſuffer*, *riſe*, and *aſcend* for « her *Honour?* It was for the Honor and Glory of « *God* indeed, but to thruſt her in, or any of the « *Saints* to ſhare in this, looks a little too familiar, « and putting them, at leaſt *her*, near upon the Level « with the *Almighty*, ſince more could not be ſaid to « him. *pag.* 130. 131. «

L. No, Sr! That very ſtrange. For I can ſay to *God*, thou art my *Creator*, my *Redeemer*, my *Sanctifyer*, my *ſovereign Good* and *laſt End*. I can ſay to *God*, thou art *infinitly powerful*, *infinitly good*, and *infinitly Wiſe*, &c. finally, I can ſay to *God*, *I offer to thee this holy Sacrifice*, and I cannot ſay any one of theſe Things to the *Bleſſed Virgin* without *Blaſphemy*. I therefore hope ſhe is not put *ſo near*, as you will needs have it, *upon the Level* with the *Almighty*.

Now, as to your Argument, which is contain'd in this ſmart Queſtion, *did Chriſt then ſuffer, riſe, and aſcend for her Honour?* You will as eaſily make a Rope of Sand, as ſhew any Connection between the Conſequence implied in your Queſtion, and the Premiſes. What admirable *Logick* is this! *The Elements are offer'd in Memory of the Paſſion, Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion of Chriſt, and in Honour of the Bleſſed Virgin Mary: therefore Chriſt ſuffer'd, and aſcended for her Honour.*

G. But what do you then mean by your *in honorem beatæ Mariæ ſemper Virginis*, &c. *in Honour of the Virgin Mary?*

L. That, Sr, is a fair Queſtion. For as we beſt know, ſo 'tis but juſt we ſhould be allow'd to ex-

plain our own Meaning, which is precisely this; we offer up the *Sacrifice* to *God* in *Remembrance of the Death, Resurrection*, and *Ascension* of *Christ*, and in *Thanksgiving* for the *great Gifts* and *Graces* he has bestow'd upon his *Blessed Mother*, and other *Saints*.

G. But how can this be call'd *Offering* the *Sacrifice* in *Honour* of the *Blessed Virgin*, &c.

L. Very properly, Sr; because the *Saints* are *honour'd* by our Celebrating their *Memories* in the solemn *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*, and Offering up our *publick Thanksgiving* to God for the *Victories* they have obtain'd *through his Grace*. And this is just what St *Austin* teaches (Ench. C. 110.) *When the Sacrifice* (says he) *is offer'd in the Church for the faithful departed, it is to such as were Good, but not perfectly good, a Sacrifice of Propitiation. But to the perfectly good, of Thanksgiving.* Now, Sr, you may proceed, if you please.

G. My Lord, you interrupted me. I told you just now, that *Offering the Sacrifice in Honour of the Virgin Mary and other Saints, was putting them near upon the Level with the Almighty.*

L. You did so.

» *G.* And here we may see a good Reason, why » *God* would not have any *Religious Worship* paid to » these, or any *Ministers* of his Kingdom, nor would » be worshipped with them. For he saw there would » be *Encroaching*, and *Coming nearer* to him, than » was fit for the Condition of *Creatures*. They would » have a Share with him. Nay that they might come » at last to advance these above *God* himself, and » prefer the *Saints* even to *Christ*. pag. 131.

L. Sr, this whole Piece comes a *Begging*; For it confidently supposes the two very Points, you ought to prove. *First*, that *God has forbid all Religious Worship*, that is, *all Honour* to be paid to his *Ministers*. Nay 'tis a Contradiction to your own Practice in

keeping one *holy Day* for *all Saints*, and another for St *Michael* and all the *Angels*. 2*dly*, it ſuppoſes that we put *Creatures* near *upon the Level* with the *Almighty*, which I have diſproved at large: But you are not diſpoſed to take Notice of any Thing I ſay to you.

G. My Lord, you were too quick for me. But I ſhall now prove, that you advance the *Saints* above *God* himſelf, and prefer them even to *Chriſt*. As it "has been ſaid, *that Chriſt did nothing, which St* Fran- "cis *did not do: yea that he did more than Chriſt himſelf.* " Lib. Conform. fol. 1149. "

L. Sr, I muſt own you have a peculiar Talent at *Raking Kennels* for *Dirt* and *Filth* to throw at us. 'Tis a Providence however, that the Words, you have pick'd up, are not to be found either in any *Council*, or *Catechiſm*, or *Papal Conſtitution*, or *Pope Pius's Profeſſion of Faith*, where you ought to ſeek for our Doctrine; but only in *Lib. Conform.* a Book I never heard of before. But whoever is the Author of it, I preſume he do's not Mean that St *Francis* (tho a moſt *holy* and *eminent Saint*) either *created the World*, or *redeem'd Mankind*, or ever wrought any *Miracle* by his *own Power*. So that we may, (I hope) acquit him of *Blaſphemy*, tho not of *Indiſcretion*. And all you can conclude from it is, that there are ſome *indiſcreet* Writers in all Churches whatſoever. But is a Church accountable for all the indiſcreet Expreſſions of particular Writers? I think not.

§. 15.

The Index Expurgatorius *examined.*

G. NOw, My Lord, we ſee the Reaſon, why "your *Index Expurgatorius* would not have "it ſeen in the *Fathers* that *God alone is to be worſhip-* "

» *ped.* For they have expunged this out of the *Indices* » of their Works, that it might not be found » by the People, who might take Offence to ſee » their *Worſhip* divided betwixt *God* and *Creatures.* » [*adorari ſolius Dei eſt:* deleatur *ex Ind. operum A-* » *thanaſii.* Indice Lib. prohib. & Expurg. pag. 52. » *Madrit.* Ann. 1627. item ex Ind. Op. S. Aug. ibid. » pag. 56.]

» Was there ever ſo ſhameleſs a Thing done by » any *Church* as to take upon them to *correct* and *al-* » *ter* the *Fathers?* It is plainly to ſtifle the Evidence » againſt themſelves, and render every Thing at » leaſt *ſuſpected*, that they quote out of them. And » the *Scriptures* had been *purged* too, but that they » are ſo common in the Hands of *Proteſtants*, that » it could not be done without manifeſt *Detection.* » but how far they have gone towards it by *Miſtranſ-* » *lations*, *Adding* or *Leaving out* ſome *Words* I have » ſhew'd already. But to purſue the Subject we are » now upon ---- *pag.* 131. 132.

L. Hold, Sr, let me anſwer this Piece firſt; and I will do it with all the Temper and Moderation poſſible; tho the *Foulneſs* of the *Miſrepreſentation*, it contains, might juſtify the warmeſt Language. You flatly charge us with *Correcting* and *Altering* the *Fathers in Order to ſtifle*, as you ſay, *their Evidence againſt us*; yet in the ſame Breath you contradict yourſelf by Confeſſing, that the *Alteration* you ſpeak of, was made only in the *Indices* of their Works. For can any Man be ſo ſtupid as to make no Difference between the *Works themſelves* of the *Fathers*, and the *Indices*, that have been ſince made to 'em by other Hands?

» You add, *that the Scriptures had been purged too,* » *but that they are ſo common in the Hands of Proteſtants,* » *that it could not be done without manifeſt Detection.*

Which

Which Reflection is as void of *Common Senſe* as *Juſtice*. For are not the *Fathers* as *Common* in the Hands of all *learned Proteſtants* as *Scriptures?* And how then could we *corrupt* the *Fathers* with *greater Security* than the *Scriptures?*

But, Sr, you forget the *many hundred Years* before the *Reformation*, wherein *Popery* was in Poſſeſſion of *whole Chriſtendom*, as your *Book of Homilies* teſtifies, and all *Proteſtants* are forced to own. And had we not then all the Opportunity imaginable to *alter* both *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, if we had been wicked enough to do it? For where were then the *Proteſtants* to controll us, or convict us of *Forgery?* Pray, Sr, let me adviſe you to think of ſome better Reaſon, than *our Fear of being detected by Proteſtants*, that hinder'd us from *Altering* the *Scriptures?* For tho this may paſs current with *Idiots*, yet Men of Underſtanding will not be impoſed upon in ſo groſs a Manner.

You ſay *our Correcting and Altering the Fathers renders every Thing, we quote out of them, ſuſpected.* But, good Sr, are our Quotations from the *Fathers* taken out of their *Indexes?* Are they not tranſcribed from their own Writings? How is it poſſible a Man of Senſe ſhould commit ſuch a Blunder! Truly nothing but an overeager Deſire of Aſperſing us could render you capable of it.

Now let us examine the *bloody Fact*, which you ſet off with this pathetick Exclamation. *Was there ever ſo shameleſs a Thing done by any Church as to take upon them to correct and alter the Fathers!* Without Diſpute, Sr, *Falſifying* the *Fathers* is a moſt ſhameful Thing: For otherwiſe I have been too hard upon you in Cenſuring you ſo ſharply for it. But I do not think it at all ſhameful to *correct* an *Index*, which miſrepreſents the *true Senſe* of the *Father's* words, it referr's to: And this is truly the *Fact*, you inveigh ſo bitterly againſt.

One *Wolfangus Muſculus* a *German Proteſtant* puts forth an Edition of ſome Works of the Fathers, and makes an *Index* to them: And to inſinuate to the Reader that it is their Doctrine, that no *Honour* is to be paid to *Saints*, he puts down in the *Index* this equivocal Expreſſion, *adorari ſolius Dei eſt*, *God alone is to be adored*, or *Worſhipped*. Which in the *Senſe* of the *Fathers*, it refers to, is certainly *true*; but *falſe* in the intended Meaning of the *Publiſher*. This therefore the *Index Expurgatorius* orders to be blotted out; becauſe it inſinuates a Senſe, which never was taught by any of the *Fathers*; who certainly mean nothing elſe, than that *God alone* is to be *Worſhipped* with *Divine Honour*.

I ſhall inſtance in a *Parallel* Caſe to ſet the Matter in a clear Light. Suppoſe a *Socinian* ſhould put forth an Edition of the *New Teſtament*, and in his *Index* to it ſhould put theſe Words, *the Son is not equal to the Father*, Referring the Reader to theſe Words of Chriſt, *My Father is greater than I.* John 14. ℣. 28. I ask, whether *your Church* would not think it very Juſt to *correct* and *alter* that *Index*? Tho the *Socinians* ſhould clamour againſt it, and cry out, *was there ever ſo ſhameleſs a Thing done by any Church, as to take upon them to correct, and alter the Scriptures!* But I really believe you would in that Caſe be clear-ſighted enough to diſcern a Difference between *Altering* the *Scripture itſelf*, and *Correcting* a *ſcandalous Index* made to it. And if you are not blinded with Paſſion, you will alſo be clear-ſighted enough to ſee, that this is a full Anſwer to your *unjuſt Clamours* againſt the *Index Expurgatorius*, and the *Calumny* your Conſcience is charged with in Repreſenting us as *Falſifyers* of the *Fathers*. But you were Going to ſay ſomething elſe, which you may now do, if you pleaſe.

§. 16.

Of Reliques.

G. MY Lord, not only the *Souls* of the *Saints* « in Heaven, but their *Dead Bodies*, or « *Bits* of them; a *Finger*, a *Toe*, or a *Tooth*, or a « *Scrap* of their *Cloaths*, a *Girdle*, or a *Book*, or any » Thing elſe, that they uſed, are *Worshipped*, and « made *Means of Grace*, and great *Miracles* are ſaid « to be done by them. *pag.* 132. «

L. Are Said, Sr, do you ſay? And dare you deny it? If you do, the *Devils* themſelves, who have confeſs'd it, will blush for you. *Vigilantius* condemn'd by all Antiquity for an *Hereſiarch*, was the *Devil's* great *Champion* againſt the *Veneration* of *Reliques*, which was the *Church's* univerſal Practice even in her *pureſt Times*. But let us hear how St *Jerom* complemented him upon it. *Vigilantius*, ſays he, *fights with an unclean Spirit againſt the Spirit of Chriſt by Aſſerting that the Tombs of Martyrs are not to be reverenced.* Lib. contra Vigil. And again, ibid. *The Devils*, with which Vigilantius *is poſſeſ'd, roar at the Reliques, and confeſs they cannot bear the Preſence of the Martyrs.* Nay in the ſame Book he tells him, that *all the Bishops in the World* are againſt him. *Ergo totius Orbis errant Epiſcopi?* &c. And in his 53. Epiſtle he writes thus. *You tell me, that* Vigilantius *vomits once more his Poiſon againſt the Reliques of Martyrs, calling us* DUST-WORSHIPPERS, AND IDOLATERS FOR REVERENCING DEAD MEN'S BONES. *Oh unhappy Man, who can never be ſufficiently lamented!*

Here, Sr, you ſee yourſelf deſcribed in the *Perſon* of *Vigilantius* by an *eminent Saint* and *Doctor* of God's *Church*: which ſhould, me thinks, ſuffice to

open your Eyes, and make you ſee the Badneſs of the Cauſe, in which you are engaged. If you had lived in the 4th Century, and profeſs'd yourſelf a *Diſciple* of *Vigilantius*, as you now do, St *Jerom* would have treated you, as he did that infamous *Heretick*. He would have told you, that *you fought with an unclean Spirit againſt the Spirit of Chriſt*. That, *you were poſſeſſed by that evil Spirit*. That *all the Biſhops in the World were againſt you*. That finally *you were in a moſt unhappy and lamentable State*.

But you think it a mighty Jeſt, that we *reverence* (or, as you call it, *Worſhip*) not only the *Bodies* of *Saints*, but a *Finger*, a *Toe*, or a *Tooth*, or a *Scrap* of their *Cloaths*. But pray, Sr, where lies the jeſt? May not the *Finger*, the *Toe*, or *Tooth* of a Saint, or a *Scrap* of his *Cloaths* work *Miracles* as well as the *Shadow* of St *Peter*? Act. 5. ℣. 15. Or the *Aprons* and *Handkerchiefs*, that but touch'd St *Paul's* Body, yet *cured Diſeaſes, and chaced away evil Spirits*? Act. 19. ℣. 12. Or muſt it needs be an *entire Body* to make it a *proper Inſtrument* for *God* to work *Miracles* with? If this be the Ground of your jeſt, *Theodoret*, who wrote in the 4th Age, will diſabuſe you. *Cities, and Vilages*, ſays he, *Dividing among themſelves the Bodies of the Martyrs eſteem them their Guardians, and the Protectors and Phyſicians both of their Souls and Bodies ---- For tho the Body be divided, the Bleſſing is not: but is bountifully diſtributed according to the Faith, with which it is approach'd*. L. 8. cont. Græcos. T. 4. p. 593. 594.

Nay the very *Aſhes* of the *Martyrs* were held in the ſame *Veneration* as their *Bodies*; as appears from *Vigilantius* his Calling the *Catholicks* DUST-WORSHIPPERS, and is witneſs'd by St *Iſidore* of *Peluſium* writing thus to a Pagan. *If this offend you, that we honour the Aſhes of Martyrs, becauſe they loved God, and ſerved him conſtantly, aſk them, who have been heal'd by*

them, and enquire into the Number of Diſtempers, from which they have been free'd? If you do this, you will be ſo far from Laughing at what we do, that you will be willing to join with us in ſo good a Practice. L. 1. Ep. 55. Pray, Sr, follow the Advice of this good *Saint*, and leave off joining with *Hereticks* and *Pagans* in *Ridiculing* Practices, which *venerable Antiquity* has ſo ſolemnly recommended to us.

I ſhall only add St *Ambroſe's* Words after his Diſcovery of the *Reliques* of St *Gervaſius* and *Protaſius*, which alone ſuffice to confute any Thing, you can ſay upon this Subject. *You have known* (ſays he) *nay you have ſeen many diſpoſſeſs'd, many cured, as ſoon as they touch'd the Shrowd of the holy Bodies, from their Infirmities. The ancient Miracles of Chriſt are renew'd. You ſee many cured by the Shadow, as it were, of their Bodies. How many Handkerchiefs are they touch'd with? How many Veils by Touching the ſacred Reliques become Inſtruments of the greateſt Cures? Every one is glad to touch the moſt diſtant Him, and if he do's it, he will be heal'd.* Ep. 22. Now, Sr, you may laugh on if you pleaſe. But even your *Proteſtant* Tranſlators of Mr *Du Pin* Cent. 8. p. 120. confeſs, *that it pleaſed God for the Teſtimony of his Doctrine and Truth to work great Miracles by the Dead Bodies of his Saints in Witneſs, that they had been his Meſſengers, and Inſtruments of his Will.*

G. My Lord, *God* may work *Miracles* by what « *Means* he pleaſes. *pag.* 132. «

L. Now, Sr, you are very good indeed. For you grant me all I deſire.

G. But do's this conſecrate the *Dead Body* of « every *Saint* to be a *Means of Grace*, and a Wor- « ker of *Miracles*? pag. 132. «

L. Sr, that is your ridiculous Conſequence, and not mine. All I ſay is, that when *God* Works *Mi-*

racles by the *Body* of any *Saint*, he certainly do's work *Miracles* by it.

» *G.* Many *Miracles* were wrought by the *Rod* of » *Moſes*, is *every Rod* therefore a *Means of Grace* ei» ther *Ghoſtly* or *Bodily*? Or may we conſecrate *any* » *Rod* to be ſuch a *Means*? pag. 132.

L. No, Sr. But if God pleaſes, he may work *Miracles* by *any Rod*. And ſo he may work *Miracles* by the *Body* of *any Saint*; and if he do's work *Miracles* by it, we may ſurely believe, that he do's work *Miracles* by it.

» *G.* Nothing is ſuch a *Means* to us, but what » God has *commanded* and *appointed* to be done, as » *Baptiſm*, and the *Lord's Supper*. pag. 132.

L. What, Sr! Did God *command* and *appoint Aprons* and *Handkerchiefs*, which wrought *Miracles*, Act. 19. ℣. 12. to be ſuch *Means of Grace* as *Baptiſm*, and the *Lord's Supper*?

» *G.* It is the *Inſtitution* and not the *Example*, that » makes any Thing a *Means of Grace* to us. Elſe we » might go and imitate all the *Miraculous* Actions of » *Moſes*, or of *Chriſt*, and call them *Means of Grace* » to us, becauſe ſo uſed by them. *pag.* 132. 133.

L. Sr, it is the *Inſtitution*, and nothing but the *Inſtitution of Chriſt* that makes *ſuch Means of Grace* as *Baptiſm*, and the *Lord's Supper*. If therefore you ſpeak of *Means* of *Grace ſtrictly* taken, the *Sacraments* alone are *ſuch Means*, as I have already frequently inculcated. But you are either very thick of Hearing, or have a ſhort Memory. For you take no Notice of any Thing I ſay, but go on Repeating the ſame Groſs Miſtakes twenty Times over as confidently, as if they were *firſt Principles*, or *Truths* allow'd of by me.

I tell you therefore once for all that the *Sacraments* alone are *Means of Grace ſtrictly* taken; which

never fail of Producing their Effect, but when ſome wilful Obſtacle is put to it. But in a *large Senſe* any Thing may be call'd a *Means of Grace*, which *God* is pleaſed to make Uſe of at any Time as an *Inſtrument* to convey his *Bleſſings* to us, tho it be not ordain'd by any *Expreſs Inſtitution* in Order to that End.

Now if you ſpeak of *Means of Grace ſtrictly taken*, what you ſay, viz. *that nothing is ſuch a Means to us, but what God has commanded and appointed to be done*, is true indeed, but nothing to the Purpoſe. But if you ſpeak of *Means of Grace* in the *largeſt Senſe*, tis abſolutely falſe, nay incoherent with what you ſaid juſt now, viz. *that God may work Miracles by what Means he pleaſes.* For, if he can work *Miracles*, as moſt certainly he can, *by what Means he pleaſes*, he can work them by *Inſtruments*, which are not *ſtrictly Means of Grace*, as the *Sacraments* are: unleſs you will maintain, that whatever *Inſtrument* God makes Uſe of to work *Miracles* by, becomes immediately a *Sacrament*, that is, a *Means of Grace ſtrictly taken*; and then Saint *Peter's Shadow*, and all the *Aprons* and *Handkerchiefs*, which touch'd St *Paul's* Body, and wrought great *Miracles*, were *Sacraments*, or *Means of Grace ſtrictly taken.*

Either therefore every Thing, by which God Works *Miracles*, is *ſtrictly a Means of Grace*, or not: if it be, then the *Aprons* and *Handkerchiefs*, that touch'd St *Paul's* Body, were *ſtrictly Means of Grace*; which is abſurd. If not, then the *Reliques* of *Saints* may alſo work *Miracles* without being *ſtrictly Means of Grace.* Whence it plainly appears, that whatever you have ſaid, or can ſay concerning our Multiplying *Means of Grace* is wholly built upon the *Equivocal Meaning* of thoſe Words; which you take a Pleaſure to repeat even to a Surfeit for no other Rea-

ſon, but becauſe they are *Equivocal*; and therefore proper to caſt a Miſt before ignorant People's Eyes.

» *G.* My Lord, as to the *Reliques* in your *Church*, » many of them have been notoriouſly detected; » and it has been found out, that the *Dead Bodies of* » *Malefactors* have been taken for the *Reliques* of » *Saints*, and great *Miracles* ſaid to be done by them. » *pag.* 133.

L. I hope, Sr, you do not mean, that great *Miracles* have been ſaid to be done by *Bodies*, after they have been found out to be the *Bodies of Malefactors*. Nor do I believe upon your bare Word that *Miracles* have been attributed to the *Bodies* of *real Malefactors*, even before your pretended *notorious Detection* of them. Perhaps you only mean ſuch a *notorious Malefactor* as St *Thomas* of *Canterbury*: who was found guilty of *high Treaſon*, and had all his *Goods confiſcated* above three hundred Years after his Death, I may ſafely ſay by one of the moſt *ridiculous Farces*, that ever was acted upon the Theater of this World.

» *G.* The ſame *Relique*, as the *Head* or *Finger* of » ſuch or ſuch a *Saint* is ſhewn in ſeveral Places, » and each contend that *their's* is the *right*, and each » have *Miracles* avouch'd for them. *pag.* 133.

L. Sr, this was fully anſwer'd at our laſt Meeting upon the Subject of *Miracles*, [1. Part. §. 25.] to which I refer you.

» *G.* Many Inſtances of this with Vouchers un- » deniable you will find in the *Devotions of the Roman* » *Church*. How then can you worſhip ſuch *Reliques* in » *Faith*, without which it is a *Sin*? pag. 133.

L. Sr, I have already told you the true Meaning of St *Paul's* ſaying, *whatever is not of Faith is Sin*, viz. that whatever is done *againſt Conſcience*, or with a *bad Intention*, is *Sin*: which may as well be applied to a Man Miſtaking *Stockfiſh* for *Ling*, as to the Subject under

under Debate. For, ſuppoſe we ſhould miſtake *falſe Reliques* for *true ones*, the *Saint*, whoſe *Reliques* we ſuppoſe them to be, is ſtill honour'd by us; and the Miſtake is as innocent, as when we give an *Alms* for *God's* Sake to a *Cheat*; which is no uncommon Caſe.

But I obſerve once more, that whenever you ſpeak of the *Reſpect* we pay to *Reliques*, you take Care to call it *Worſhip*; becauſe the Word is *ambiguous* and may ſignify *Divine Worſhip*, as well as an *inferiour* or *Relative Honour*, and you pioufly hope that it will be taken in the *wrong Senſe*. I therefore deſire you to take Notice, that we *worſhip Reliques*, or the *Images of Chriſt* and his *Saints* no otherwiſe than you worſhip the *Altar*, or the *Bible*, when you *bow* to it. If you deny that you *worſhip* them in Paying that *Reſpect* to 'em, we do the ſame. If you grant you *worſhip* them, then *Creatures* may be *worſhipped* with a *Relative Honour*, and you cannot blame us for it.

In Effect no one Word is more *Equivocal* than the Word *Worſhip*, and it is manifeſt, that all Reaſoning from ſuch *Ambiguous* Words is nothing at the Bottom but *Fallacy* and *Amuſement*, and a meer Deſign to confound and perplex People in Order to hide from them the *true State* of the *Queſtion*. Pray, Sr, remember this, when you ſpeak of *Images*, which I preſume will come next upon the Board.

§. 17.

Of Images.

G. YEs, My Lord. For not only the *Saints*, and « their *Reliques*, but their *Images* are with you « made a diſtinct *Means of Grace*: For in the *Conſe-* « *cration* of the *Image* of a *Saint* it is ſaid, that who- « ever ſhall worſhip ſuch a Saint, *coram hac Imagine*, «

» *before this Image*, may obtain ſo and ſo, for which » End the *Image* is *bleſſed* and *ſanctified*. So that it is » not enough to worship the *Saint*; but if I do it » *before ſuch a conſecrated Image*, I ſhall obtain more » *Grace* than otherwiſe. This makes the *Image* itſelf » a *Means of Grace*, for there is Virtue *there*. Why » elſe would it not do as well to pray, and not be- » fore ſuch an Image? Why elſe indeed are ſuch » *Images* ſo formally *conſecrated*, if there be no *Vir-* » *tue* in the *Conſecration?* And why do Men go Pilgri- » mages, or ſend Vows to *Loretto*, or any other diſ- » tant Place, if they think there is no *Virtue* in the » *Image* there more than in forty of the ſame Sort, » which they may have at Home? And the *Saint* re- » preſented by the *Image* is as near them in the one » Place as in the other. There muſt then be ſome » *Virtue* communicated to one *Image* more than to » another. *pag.* 133. 134.

L. Sr, there were many *Pools* in *Judæa* beſides the *Pool* call'd *Bethsheda*. Joh. 5. *v.* 2. Yet God would only cure the Sick in this. There were alſo many *Rods* beſides the *Rod* of *Moſes*, and many *Aprons* beſides thoſe, that touch'd the *Body* of Saint *Paul*; yet God wrought *Miracles* only by thoſe. And why then may he not beſtow a *Bleſſing* on one *Place* or *Image* more than another? And if he can do it, why ſhould we not ask it of him? This, Sr, anſwers all your fine *Queries*.

But I ſhall inſtance in a *Scriptural Fact* reſembling very much the *Bleſſing* or *Conſecration*, with which you are pleaſed to make ſo much Mirth. It is written 1. *Kings C.* 8. that *Salomon dedicated* or *conſecrated* the *Temple*, he had built in *Jeruſalem*: And the whole *Subject* of the *Prayer*, or *Form* of *Conſecration* is to beg of God, that whoever ſhall pray *in* or *towards that Houſe*, may obtain ſo and ſo, as is ſpecified in the *Form* of *Conſecration*.

Now, Sr, let us ſuppoſe ſome *Atheiſtical Jew* ſhould have reaſon'd thus in your Language. *The Temple is here made a diſtinct* MEANS OF GRACE; *for in the Conſecration of the Temple it is ſaid, that whoever ſhall worſhip God* IN OR TOWARDS THAT HOUSE, MAY OBTAIN SO AND SO; *for which End the Temple is bleſſed and ſanctified. So that it is not enough to worſhip God, but if I do it* IN OR TOWARDS SUCH A HOUSE, *I ſhall obtain more grace than otherwiſe. This makes the Houſe itſelf a* MEANS OF GRACE; FOR THERE IS VIRTUE THERE. *Why elſe ſhould it not do as well to pray, and not* IN, OR TOWARDS THAT HOUSE? *Why elſe indeed is that Houſe ſo formally conſecrated, if there be no Virtue in the Conſecration? And why do Men* GO PILGRIMAGES, *and* SEND THEIR VOWS *to the* Temple *in Jeruſalem, if they think there is no Virtue in that Houſe more than in any other Place? And God, who is worſhipped in that Houſe,* IS AS NEAR US IN ONE PLACE AS ANOTHER. *There muſt be then ſome virtue communicated to one Houſe more than to another.*

Sr, whenever you anſwer this *prophane* Diſcourſe of the ſuppoſed *Jew*, you will not be at a Loſs for an Anſwer to your own.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The good-natured Lord *in the* former Converſation *acquieſces to every Thing, his Adverſary has ſaid, and only tells him calmly*, then you are againſt any Pictures or Images, or Paying any Honour to the holy Men departed: *which gives Occaſion to the* Gentleman *to anſwer thus.*

G. NO, My Lord, we are not ſo ſtingy: We « ſcruple not *Pictures* for *Ornament*, but for « *Worſhip*, or for Worſhipping *before them*, as you « call it. *pag.* 134. «

L. That's very ſtrange indeed. Suppoſe you had a *Picture* or *Image* of *Chriſt crucified* before you, would you ſcruple to ſay your *Prayers*, or adore God with your Face turn'd *towards it*? But why do you not likewiſe Scruple to pray with your Face turn'd *towards* the *Altar*, or *Communion-Table*? for then you *worſhip before it*, as we do before *Pictures*: and we worſhip *Pictures* no otherwiſe than you worſhip the *Altar* or *Communion-Table* by *Bowing* to it, or *kneeling* before it.

§. 18.

The Church of England *guilty of Incoherency.*

» *G.* WE alſo *honour* the *Saints departed* as far » as we think it *Lawful*, and as we are » verily perſuaded, as far as they *deſire*. pag. 134.

L. That's very well done, Sr, and we are *verily perſuaded*, we do no more.

» *G.* But according to St *Auſtin's Rule before men-* » *tion'd*, if they accepted our *Adoration*, it would » prove them to be *evil Spirits*: and then you are to » conſider, that inſtead of *Interceſſors*, as you hope » for by your *Worſhip* of them, they will vindicate » themſelves, and become your *Accuſers*. pag. 134.

L. Sr, you ſhould have ſaid, *according to St Auſtin's Rule before* FALSIFIED. Pray learn to ſpeak properly. For St *Auſtin* neither calls it *Adoration*, as you render it *now*, nor *Worſhip*, as you render'd it *before*, but SACRIFICE; and in plain Terms, *to be Worſhipped* AS GODS. So that there is no Danger of their Becoming our *Accuſers*, as long as we only deſire a *Part* in thoſe *Prayers*, which they continually offer to God for the *Church Militant*. And this is all we deſire of them.

» *G.* But in the *Honour* we pay them, we firſt take

Care not to *ſpecify* any particular Perſon as a *Saint*, « but who is ſo recorded in *holy Scripture*. For we un- « derſtand not *Canonizations* by Men, who know not « the *Heart*. pag. 134. «

L. But when *Almighty God*, who knows the *Hearts* of Men, has manifeſted their *Holineſs* by *evident Miracles*, are we allow'd to doubt of it? the *Ancient Fathers* were not ſo *Scrupulous*; for they invoked not only *Scriptural Saints*, but likewiſe thoſe, whom the *living Voice* of the *Church* had *canonized*. Saint *Auſtin* pray'd to St *Cyprian*. L. 7. de Bapt. C. 1. St *Jerom* to St *Paula*. Epiſt. 27. St *Gregory Nyſſen* to St *Theodore*. Tom. 3. p. 585. C. and St *Gregory Nazianzen* to St *Baſil*. Orat. 20. T. 1. p. 373. B. And they invoked them *by Name*, and call'd them *Saints*, tho not recorded in *holy Scripture*, which it ſeems your *tender Conſcience* will not allow of.

However, good Sr, *your Church* is not ſo *ſcrupulous* as you would make her. Pray read the *Calendar* of your *Common Prayer-Book*. For there you will find ſeveral *Saints* ſpecified by Name, and not recorded in *Holy Scriptures*; which I hope will help to cure you of the ſqueamish fit, you are faln into.

G. In the next Place, My Lord, we limit the « *Honour* we pay to *Saints* by the *Rule* of *God's Com-* « *mandements*, which we ſuppoſe moſt pleaſing to « them. *pag.* 134. «

L. Do you only ſuppoſe it, Sr? Nay we are ſure of it. For how ſhould any Thing, that is *diſpleaſing* to *God*, be *Pleaſing* to the *Saints*?

G. We keep particular *Holy Days* for the *Apoſ-* « *tles*, St *John Baptiſt*, St *Stephen*, &c. we bleſs God « for them, commemorate their *Virtues*, and pray « that we may follow their *Example*. pag. 135. «

L. So far then we agree. And, if keeping *Holy Days* be any part of *Chriſtian Devotion*, as I preſume

it is, this is just what we mean by what we call, *Religious Honour*.

» *G.* We have one Day for all the *Saints in General*, and another for St *Michael*, and all the *Angels*. Thus we *honour* them. *pag.* 135.

L. Sr, I am glad to hear it: For all this is very good *Popery*.

» *G.* For this, My Lord, we bear the *Reproach* » of our *four Dissenters*, as if we were too much Inclining to *Popery*. You think we give *too little Honour* to the *Saints*, and they think we give *too much*, » but I hope we keep the *Mean*. pag. 135.

L. Sr, notwithstanding your *pretended Mean*, your *Church* cannot avoid Splitting upon one of these *Rocks*. For, if it be forbid to pay any Sort of *Religious Worship* or *Honour* to the *Saints*, your keeping *holy Days* in *Honour* of them is unjustifiable. But if there be an *Honour* due to 'em, and if it be Lawful to pay them that *Honour* by keeping *solemn Days* in Memory of them; to refuse after that to pay a *Relative Honour* to the *Pictures*, that represent them, or the *Reliques* that were a Part of them, is perfectly inconsistent with common Sense; and the *Mean*, you boast of, is no better than a practical Contradiction to the Principle you allow of. Because Reason itself, and the Practice of all Mankind tells us, that when a Person has a just Title to be *honour'd* by us, we may lawfully pay a *Respect* to Things, that have a near *Relation* to him; and when this Title is wholly grounded upon a *Motive* of *Religion*; as when we *honour* a Person whether *Dead* or *alive* meerly for *Supernatural Gifts* bestow'd upon him by *God*, then the *Honour* we pay him is not *Civil*, but *Religious*. And such is by Consequence the *Honour*, you pay to *Saints* and *Angels*, when you keep *holy Days* in Memory of them.

For this Reaſon the *four Diſſenters* (as you call them) laugh at you as meer *Botchers* in the *Reforming Trade*. For whoever will ſet up for a *Reformer* of the publick *Faith* or *Diſcipline* of his *Mother-Church*, muſt go thoroug-ſtitch with the Work. Otherwiſe he do's *enough* to be condemn'd by the *Church*, from which he *ſeparates* himſelf, and *too little* to avoid the Reproach of Falling into *Incoherencies*. Becauſe what he leaves *unreform'd* riſes for the moſt Part in Judgment againſt him, and kicks down ſome Article of his *pretended Reformation*.

§. 19.

The Subject of Images *reſumed.*

G. "WE abſtain from the *Pictures* or *Images* of "the *Saints* in our *Churches*, becauſe they "have been abuſed to *Superſtition*, and to avoid Of- "fence. But in Places not dedicated to Worſhip, "as in our private Houſes, we think them not un- "lawful more than the *Picture* of any good Man. "*pag.* 135. "

L. Truly, Sr, the *Saints* are very much obliged to you for Allowing them a Place in your *private Houſes* amongſt thoſe of *Good Men*. However I think the *Apoſtles* at leaſt have ſome Reaſon to take it ill, that *Moſes* and *Aaron*, whoſe *Pictures* are admitted into many of *your Churches*, ſhould be preferr'd before them.

G. Epiphanius was very zealous againſt having "them brought into *Churches:* and tells *John* Biſhop "of *Jeruſalem* in a Letter tranſlated by St *Jerom*, that "finding a linnen Cloth hang up in a Church-door "(it is likely to keep out the Wind) whereon was "a *Picture* of *Chriſt*, or of ſome *Saint*, he tore it, and "

» order'd a Dead Corps to be buried in it. And he » lamented the *Superſtition* he ſaw coming by theſe » *Pictures* and *Images* then beginning to creep into the » Church. *pag.* 135.

L. Sr, all we can gather from this Story of St *Epiphanius* is, that he judg'd, that the ancient *Pagan Idolatry* was not yet then ſo utterly abolish'd (as it certainly was not at that Time in many Places) but that the Uſe of *Images* or *Pictures* in *Churches* might be an Occaſion to revive it. He therefore did his Duty in Oppoſing the Uſe of them: And 'tis what any Bishop or Paſtor would do at preſent, if he had the ſame rational Motive to induce him to it. For 'tis certain the *Church* never obliged the Faithful to the *actual* Uſe or Veneration of *Images* or *Pictures* as a Thing *eſſential to Chriſtianity*. On the contrary 'tis a Point of *Diſcipline* only, which was not *univerſally* practiſed, till *Idolatry* was utterly extinguish'd in *Chriſtendom*. But ſince that Time the Church had Reaſon to declare, *that the Images of Chriſt and his Saints are to be retain'd, and that a due Honour and Veneration is to be given them.* Conc. Trid. Sef. 25.

» *G.* My Lord, the *Abuſe* of Things tho otherwiſe Lawful, which are not *inſtituted* by *God* for » ſtanding *Means of Grace*, as *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's* » *Supper* may juſtly take away the Uſe of them. » *pag.* 136.

L. That's very true, Sr; But 'tis not fit for a private Man to make himſelf *Judge* to determine whether they are abuſed or not.

» *G.* The *Brazen Serpent* was appointed by God as » a *Means of Grace* for miraculous *Cures* in the Wilderneſs, and was preſerved until the Days of *He*» *zekiah.* 2. King. 18. *v.* 4. But when they burned *In*» *cenſe* to it, it became an *Idol*, was broke to Pieces, » and call'd by a contemptible Name *Nehuſhtan*: that

that is, a Bit of Braſs. How much more Reaſon is « there to remove the *Pictures* and *Images* of *Saints* « (which God never appointed) out of our *Chur-* « *ches*, when wee ſee *Incenſe* burnt to them, and they « *Worshipped* in your Churches as *Means of Grace?* « And yet there is no Evil in the *Pictures* themſelves. « *pag.* 136. «

L. Sr, the *Pictures* and *Images* of *Saints* are neither *Worshipped in*, nor *out* of our *Churches* as *Means of Grace*; nor do we believe any intrinſick Virtue in them. But this pretty Conceit of our pretended *Means of Grace* tickles your Fancy ſo powerfully, that you cannot hold Thruſting it in every where by Head and Shoulders, whether there be Occaſion for it or not:

As to what you ſay, that we burn *Incenſe* to them, Sr, we burn *Incenſe* to *one another* in the ſame Manner as we do to *Pictures*: And yet I hope we are not ſo mad as to make *Idols* of, or pay *Divine Honour* to one another. There are ſeveral Ways of Shewing *Reſpect* both to *God* and *Man*. We *bow* to *God*, and we *bow* to *Men*. We alſo *kneel* to *God*, and ſo we do to *Men*. But, tho the *outward Action* be the ſame, I preſume the *Reſpect* we shew by it is not ſo. For 'tis ſtrictly *Adoration*, or *Divine Worship* when we *kneel* to *God*, and only an *inferiour Reſpect*, when we *kneel* to *Men*.

Now, Sr, one Way of shewing our *Reſpect* is that of *Burning Incenſe*, which is an Action as *indifferent* in itſelf, as that of *Bowing* or *Kneeling*. So that as *Bowing* or *Kneeling* are not appropriated to *God alone*, nor always uſed as an Indication of *Divine Excellency* in the Thing, or Perſon we honour by thoſe Actions, ſo neither is the Uſe of *Incenſe* amongſt *Chriſtians*. When we offer it to God, we ſignify by it the *Sovereign Honour*, we owe him: but when to *Creatures*, it is no more than a Ceremony to expreſs the *Reſpect*

we have for them on Account of the *Relation* they have to *God*.

Bellarmin L. 2. de Miſſa C. 15. ſhews the *Antiquity* of this Ceremony; and the Significations of it are many, and all tending to excite Piety and Devotion in the Faithful: as, to put us in Mind of the *Inacceſſible Glory* of *God*, who appear'd in a *Cloud*, and the *ſweet Odour* of our *Prayers*, if ſent up from a Heart inflamed with *Divine Love*.

G. But, My Lord, the *Scripture* tells us, that *Hezekiah* broke the *Brazen Serpent*, becauſe the *Children* of *Iſrael* burnt *Incenſe* to it: which ſhews that their *Burning Incenſe* to it made it become an *Idol*.

L. Sr, tis very certain, that the *Iſraelits* in Proceſs of Time made an *Idol* of the *Brazen Serpent*: And therefore *Hezekiah* made no Difference between it, and the *Statues* ſet up in the *high Places*, which were certainly *Idols*, and worshipped as ſuch by the *Jews*. So that altho they had but *bow'd* or *kneel'd* to them, it would have been an *Act* of *Idolatry*: Becauſe any *Reſpect* whatſoever ſhewn to an *Idol* is an *Idolatrous Worship*. But their *Burning Incenſe* to the *Brazen Serpent* was a *Special Act* of *Idolatry* in a *Jew*, becauſe the *Burning* of *Incenſe* by Way of a *Religious Reſpect* was appropriated to *God* by a *Ceremonial* Part of the *Moſaick Law*, Exod. 29. ℣. 13. Levit 7. ℣. 5. &c. and there was an *Altar* deputed particularly for it. *Luke* 1. ℣. 11. But there is not any Precept in the *Goſpel* either *Commanding*, or *Forbidding* the Uſe of *Incenſe* to *Chriſtians*, or Appropriating it to *God*: And *where no Law is, there is no Tranſgreſſion*, Rom. 4. ℣. 15. And by Conſequence the Uſe of *Incenſe* amongſt *Chriſtians* even by Way of a *Religious Honour* is a Thing as *indifferent* as the Actions of *Bowing* or *Kneeling*, which I preſume do not make *Idols* of the *Perſons* or *Things*, towards which they are uſed.

§. 20.

Concerning Images *of* God.

G. BUt, My Lord, I think there is one *Picture* « has Evil in it, and is unlawful any where: « And yet it is seen in your *Churches*, and common- « ly over the *Altar*. That is, the *Picture* or *Image* of « *God* the *Father*, like an *Old Man*, &c. We are « forbid to *make* it, and then we cannot *worship* it. « See how positively God forbids it, *Deut.* 4. ℣. 15. « &c. *take good Heed unto yourselves (for you saw no* « *Manner of Similitude*, that is, of *God*, *in the Day* « *that the Lord spake unto you)* ------ *least you corrupt* « *yourselves, and make you a graven Image, the Simili-* « *tude of any Figure, the likeness of Male or Female*, &c. « And again. *They changed the Glory of the incorruptible* « *God into an Image like to corruptible Man*, &c. *Rom.* « 1. ℣. 23. pag. 136. «

L. Sr, this latter *Text* of St *Paul* condemns the *Pagan Worship* of *Idols*, as I have shew'd before: And the Consequence you draw from it is, that *therefore it is unlawful to make any Picture or Image of God.* And is not this Arguing with most exquisite Skill!

But I presume the Text of *Deuteronomy* is to supply all Defects: For it is introduced with Sound of Trumpet, and I am summon'd by you *to see how positively it forbids the Making any Picture, or Image of God.* Truly, Sr, when I first heard myself thus solemnly call'd upon, *see how positively God forbids it*, I apprehended nothing less, than to find in some of the four *Evangelists* this Commandement in express Terms, *Thou shalt not make a Picture or Image of God the Father like an old Man.* But the *Text*, you have

quoted, has very much relieved me; finding especially, that it is not in any of the *Gospels*, but only in *Deuteronomy*, which contains indeed the *Jewish ceremonial Law*, but meddles not with the Discipline of the *Christian Church*. However since you desire it so earnestly of me, I will do what I can to *see* the *positive Prohibition* you speak of. But as yet I can only see two Things, and those I see very plainly. *First*, that there is no such *positive Prohibition* in the *Text* you have quoted: and *2dly*, that were there such a Prohibition in that *Text*, it would make nothing against us.

As to the *first*, to convince you that I am not mistaken, let us have the *Text* entire, which is thus. *Take ye therefore good Heed unto yourselves (For ye saw no Manner of Similitude on the Day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the Midst of the Fire) ℣. 15. Least ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven Image, the Similitude of any Figure, the Likeness of Male or Female. ℣. 16. The Likeness of any Beast, that is on the Earth, the Likeness of any winged Foul, that flieth in the Air. ℣. 17. The Likeness of any Thing that creepeth on the Ground, the Likeness of any Fish, that is in the Waters beneath the Earth. ℣. 18. And least thou lift up thine Eyes unto Heaven, and when thou Sees't the Sun and the Moon, and the Stars, even all the Host of Heaven, thou shouldst be driven to worship them, and serve them, which the Lord thy God has divided unto all Nations under the Heaven. ℣. 19.*

This, Sr, is the whole *Text*; and I observe *first*, that these Words *(for ye saw no Manner of Similitude on the Day, that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb)* are no Part of the *Law*, or *Commandement* here deliver'd by *Moses*. For they are placed within a *Parenthesis*, which separates and distinguishes them from the *Words* of the *Law*. Neither do they *command* or *for-*

bid any Thing, but nakedly relate a *Matter* of *Fact*. Nay they are thus placed within a *Parentheſis* in your own Bible.

Whence I obſerve 2*dly*, that the *Law* itſelf is entirely contain'd in theſe Words. *Take ye therefore good Heed unto yourſelves leaſt you corrupt yourſelves, and make you a graven Image, the Similitude of any Figure, the Likeneſs of Male or Female, the Likeneſs of any Beaſt that is on the Earth, the Likeneſs of any winged Foul that flieth in the Air, the Likeneſs of any Thing that creepeth on the Earth, the Likeneſs of any Fiſh, that is in the Waters beneath the Earth*, &c.

Now, Sr, tho I have at preſent both my Eyes open, I want your Spectacles to *ſee* in what Words God here *poſitively forbids* any *Image*, *Likeneſs*, or *Similitude* to be made of *himſelf*. 'Tis true, I plainly ſee theſe three Words, *Image*, *Likeneſs*, and *Similitude*: But I likewiſe ſee the Things, they are referr'd to, expreſſly ſpecified, viz. the *Likeneſs* of a *Male* or *Female*, of *Beaſts*, of *Fiſh*, of *Foul*, and *Creeping Things*: and theſe the *Jews* were *poſitively forbid* to make by the *Text* you have quoted: But I am yet too blind to ſee the Force of this Conſequence, ergo, *that Text poſitively forbids any Image to be made of God.*

G. But, My Lord, tho theſe Words, *for you ſaw no Manner of Similitude on the Day that the Lord ſpoke unto you in Horeb*, be no *Part* of the *Law*, yet they are at leaſt the *Reaſon* of the *Law*, and that ſuffices to make Good the Conſequence I draw from them.

L. No, Sr, they are not even the *Reaſon* of the *Law*. For tho *God* ſhould have appear'd to the People in ſome *viſible Likeneſs*, as he did afterwards to *Daniel*, yet the Reaſon of the Law would have been the ſame; viz. to keep the People out of the Occaſion of *Idolatry*, to which they were exceſſively inclined.

G. But was it then lawful for the *Jews* to make *Images* of *God*?

L. I do not ſay it was; nor is it any Thing to the Purpoſe, whether it was or not. All I pretend to maintain is, that it was not forbid by the *Text* you have quoted; on which nevertheleſs you lay as much Streſs, as if it were Nothing inferiour to a Demonſtration.

G. But, My Lord, to what End was it then, that *Moſes* put the People in Mind, *that they ſaw no Similitude of God in Horeb*, if it was not to inſinuate, that God forbad them to make any *Image* of himſelf?

L. Sr, this is only a *Gueſs* or *Inference* of your own, but no Part of the *Law itſelf*, as I have clearly ſhew'd: And therefore comes very short of your former Triumphant Expreſſion, SEE HOW POSITIVELY GOD FORBIDS IT! However, ſince you will needs oblige me to give a Reaſon, why *Moſes* put the People in Mind, *that they ſaw no Similitude of God in Horeb*, I conceive that *Moſes* put them in Mind of it for the very ſame Reaſon for which Almighty God did not ſhew himſelf to the People in any *viſible Likeneſs*. And if I may be allow'd to gueſs why he did not then ſhew himſelf in ſuch a Manner, it appears to me moſt probable, that it was to prevent their Entertaining an *Erroneous Idea* of *God*, and Imagining him to be a corporeal being; as that groſs and carnal People would have been apt enough to do. But to pretend that barely Mentioning a *Fact* implies a *poſitive Prohibition* any more than the *Fact itſelf* is not I think agreeable to common Senſe. And I never heard any Man ſay, that God's not Appearing to the *People* in a *viſible Likeneſs* was any more a *poſitive Prohibition* to make an *Image* of him, than his Appearing in a *viſible Likeneſs* to *Daniel* was a *poſitive Command* to make one.

But let us now ſuppoſe the *Jews* were *poſitively forbid* by this *Law* of *Deuteronomy* to make any *Image* of

God, did not the ſame Law as poſitively forbid them to make *Images* of *Men* or *Women*; of *Fiſh*, or *Fowl*, or *Beaſts*, or *Creeping Things?* And are *Chriſtians* concern'd in that *Law?* If ſo, then all the *Statues* in the *Royal Exchange*, and Thouſands more muſt be pull'd down; the *Lion* and *Unicorn* muſt be removed out of your *Churches*, and all *Statuaries* banish'd out of *Chriſtendom*. 'Tis therefore manifeſt, that the whole *Text*, you have quoted, contains only a *Ceremonial Law*, and is by Conſequence as little to the Purpoſe (allowing even that it *poſitively forbids* the Making any *Image* of *God*) as if you had quoted the *Law* of *Circumciſion* to prove the Point in Queſtion.

It is indeed a Thing unlawful in *Chriſtians* as well as *Jews* to have *Pictures* or *Images* of *God* ſo as to think them to be Repreſentations of the *Divine Nature*; and there needs no more to forbid this than the very firſt Principles of *reveal'd Religion*.

G. Pray, My Lord, did you ever know a *Painter* or *Statuary*, who attempted to draw a *Picture*, or make an *Image* of a *Thought*, or of a *Soul?* And is not the great God more *inviſible*, and the *Divine Nature* much more *incomprehenſible* even to our *Thoughts* or *Imaginations?* How then can it be repreſented to our *Eyes?* I dare ſay there never was a Man ſince *Adam*, who would own any ſuch Thing, or ever had ſo foolish a Thought. No, but when they drew any *Picture* or *Similitude* of *God*, it was only meant to expreſs ſome of his *Attributes* or *Perfections*. As by *Fire* his *Purity:* by a *Giant* with many *Hands* his *Power*, with many *Eyes* his *Providence*, &c. And ſo you own, that by an *Old Man* you only mean to expreſs his *Antiquity*. And will not this excuſe the *Heathen* as well as you? See the ſame excuſe made by *Maximus Tyrius*. Diſſ. 38. *Whether Statues were to be made for the Gods?* But

» here you would put an *impoſſible Meaning* upon the » *Prohibition* of *God* to make it of no Effect; and » which will excuſe the *Heathens* as well as yourſel- » ves. *pag.* 137. 138.

L. Sr, if Making *Images* or *Pictures* of the *true God*, that is, Repreſenting him in that *viſible Likeneſs*, in which he has really shew'd himſelf to Men; if this I ſay be the ſame as Making *Images* of *falſe Gods*, then I will allow that the *Heathens* may in this Reſpect be excuſed as well as we. But I forget, alas, that the *Heathen Jupiter* was the *true God*, as you have labour'd hard to prove him. Tho *Origen*, and the primitive Chriſtians believed him to be a *Devil*: And as I am altogether of their Mind, I think that Drawing Pictures and Similitudes to honour the *Devil* is not quite ſo excuſable as Doing it to honour *God*.

Now let us ſee what may be ſaid to your firſt ingenious Queſtion. Viz. *Whether I ever knew a Painter or Statuary, who attempted to draw a Picture or make an Image of a Thought?* To which I anſwer directly, that at what Time ſoever a *Thought* ſhall appear in a *viſible Shape* or Likeneſs, I will then bring you acquainted with a *Painter* or *Statuary*, who ſhall attempt to draw a *Picture*, or make an *Image* of it. I anſwer *2dly*, that no Picture can be made of a *Thought*, or any ſpiritual Thing ſo as to be a true Repreſentation of it's proper Nature.

But here you make a ſecond Aſſault upon me, and ask again, *And is not the great God more inviſible, and the Divine Nature more incomprehenſible even to our Thoughts and Imaginations? How then can it be repreſented to our Eyes?* Sr, the *Divine Nature* is *infinite*, *inviſible*, and *incomprehenſible*, and therefore can no more be repreſented as it is *in itſelf* than a *Thought*. But the *Likeneſs*, in which God has appear'd, may be repreſented:

ſented: For I preſume there are *Painters*, that can draw the *Pictures*, and *Statuaries* that can make the *Images* of an *Old Man*, and a *Dove*: And you cannot be ſo ignorant of Scripture-hiſtory, as not to know, that *God* the *Father* appear'd to *Daniel* in the *Likeneſs* of an *Old Man*, and *God* the *Holy Ghoſt* appear'd at our Saviour's Baptiſm in the *Likeneſs* of a *Dove*. Theſe *Corporeal Figures* therefore may lawfully be *painted*; Nay that of the *Holy Ghoſt* in the *Likeneſs* of a *Dove* is to be ſeen in all your *Common-Prayer-Books*, that are printed with *Cuts*: Which by the by is a full Confutation of the Paradox you maintain, viz. *that it is unlawful to make the Picture of God the Father like an Old Man.* For the *Holy Ghoſt* is as *truly God* as the *Father*; and if it be lawful to paint the *Holy Ghoſt* like a *Dove*, as your *Church* makes no Scruple to do, how it ſhould be unlawful to paint the *Father* like an *Old Man* is a Myſtery wholly incomprehenſible to my weak Underſtanding.

All then that is unlawful or forbid in theſe and other ſuch like Pictures is to imagine, that any corporeal Figure can be a *true Repreſentation* of the *Divinity* itſelf. But this you ſay is *putting an impoſſible Meaning upon the Prohibition of God: and you dare averr there never was a Man ſince* Adam, *who would own any ſuch Thing, or ever had ſo foolish a Thought.* What, Sr! has there never been a Man ſince *Adam* capable of ſuch a Foolish Thought! If I miſtake not, I can name you a great many. For ſurely the *Hereticks* call'd *Audiani* lived ſince the Time of *Adam*; and they held that *God* the *Father* had a *human* Shape with *Arms*, *Hands*, *Legs*, &c. that *Adam's* Likeneſs to *God* was in his *Body*; and that *Chriſt* ſits literally at the *right Hand* of *God* the *Father*.

2*dly*, *Tertullian* a Wit of the firſt Rank thought the Soul a *Corporeal* Subſtance. *Nothing* (ſays he) *is incorporeal, but that which is Nothing.* L. de carne Chriſt.

ti. C. 11. And again. *God is a Spirit. But who will deny that he is a Body? A Spirit is one Sort of Body, and has it's own Shape.* L. contra Prax. C. 7.

Laſtly, St *Paul* thought it proper to admonish even the *wiſe Athenians*, that there can be no true *Likeneſs* made of *God*. *We ought not to think* (ſays he) *that the* GODHEAD IS LIKE UNTO GOLD OR SILVER, OR STONE GRAVEN BY ART, AND MAN'S DEVICE. *And the Time of* THIS IGNORANCE *God Winked at, but now commands all Men every where to repent.* Act. 17. ℣. 29. 30. 'Tis therefore evident that ſome Men ſince *Adam* were ſo *ignorant* as to think the *Godhead like to the Statues of Gold or Silver graven by Art and Man's Device.* And I hope you will not take it ill, if I rather think you groſſly out in maintaining the contrary, than that St *Paul* was miſtaken, or ſpoke impertinently to the *Athenians*.

'Tis certain the *Heathens* Worshipp'd their *Idols* as *Gods*. *Turn ye not unto Idols, nor make to yourſelves molten Gods.* Lev. 19. ℣. 4. And the *Iſraelits* ſaid of the *golden Calf*, *theſe are the Gods, that brought thee out of Ægypt.* And again. *They changed their Glory into the Similitude of a Calf that eateth Graſs.* Pſal. 106. ℣. 20.

§. 21.

Of Heathen Idols, *and the* Golden Calf.

» *G.* MY Lord, it is abſurd to ſay, that the *Hea-*
» *thens* thought their *Images* to be the
» Things, of which they were the *Images*. That was
» impoſſible; for then they would not be the *Ima-*
» *ges*, but the *Things* themſelves. Who ever ſaid,
» that a Man's *Picture* was himſelf? Tho they are
» call'd the *Perſons*; as when we look upon *Pictures*

we ſay, *this is ſuch* or *ſuch a Man.* But if any should « put it upon us, that we mean the *Perſons* themſelves, we muſt think them *Idiots* or *School-men*, « that love Diſtinctions and Wrangling. *Maximus Tyrius* in the *Deſertation* before quoted tells us, « that they had many *Images* of the ſame God, as « of *Venus*, *Diana*, &c. and yet they did not think « there was more than one *Venus*, or one *Diana*. Have « you not Multitudes of the *Pictures* and *Images* of the « *Virgin Mary?* And yet you ſay not that there is « more than one ſuch *Virgin*. Now the *Heathens* « worshipped their *Images*; and if you believe your « own *Catechiſm*, you muſt think, that they took « every one for *God*. For, *hæc omnia*, they worshipped all theſe as *God*. «

And it is as abſurd to think, that they took « that *Serpent* or *Beaſt*, whoſe *Image* they made, to « be *God*. Or if they meant not any particular *Ser-* « *pent* or *Ox* (for Example) by the *Image*, they muſt « think every *Ox* or *Serpent* to be *God!* But they « were not ſo ridiculous; as *Maximus Tyrius*, and all « as many of them as have wrote will ſatisfy you. « But they made Uſe of their *Images* only as *Symbols*, « which being *dedicated* to ſuch a God. They thought « that this *God* would afford his Preſence with his « *Symbol*, and by it ſecure to them his favour, and « Protection. How near your *Conſecration* comes to « their *Dedication* of *Images*, I leave you to Judge. « But you put ſuch monſtrous Things upon the *Hea-* « *thens*, as they diſown, deteſt, and abhor. And yet « you muſt do it, that your Caſe and theirs may not « appear ſo very like. *pag.* 138. 139. «

L. Sr. This Reflection together with your Comparing our *Bleſſing* of *Images* with the *Heathen Conſecration* of *Idols* is equally ſcurrilous and unjuſt.

You ſay, we charge the *Heathens* with *Abſurdities*

only to *acquit* ourſelves; but it is very apparent, you *acquit* the *Heathens* only to load us with *Infamy*. And indeed the *tender concern* you ſhew upon all Occaſions for the *Reputation* of the *Heathens* would make one think you have adopted them into the Number of your *Proteſtant Brethren*. But why ſhould this ſurpriſe me? Since you own that you and they are united in the *Worſhip* of *one* and the *ſame God*. Their *Jupiter*, (as you have endeavour'd to prove) was the *true God*, and by Conſequence is ſo ſtill. Their *Inferiour Gods* were but *Symbols* of his *Divine Perfections*: Their *Statues* were not worſhipped as *God*, and the *Sacrifices* they offer'd to 'em, were but a *relative Honour*, which wholly *terminated* in the *true God*. And who would not now be ambitious to communicate with ſuch *true Worſhippers of God*! Really, Sr, I am almoſt grown fond of their Company, and begin to think you have done the *Papiſts* a great Deal of Honour in putting them upon the ſame Foot with the *Heathens*.

G. Bantering, My Lord, is eaſier than *Anſwering*. But I ſhould be glad to hear you ſay ſomething to the Reaſons I have given to prove that the *Heathens* could not be guilty of the *Abſurdities*, you lay to their Charge.

L. Sr, you have effectually proved them to be groſs *Abſurdities*, and I readily grant them to be ſo. But is that a good Proof, that the *Heathens* were not guilty of them? Or was their *Religion* ſo very *Rational*, that no *Abſurdity* could be a Part of it? How happy would Mankind be, if Proving a Thing to be *Abſurd* were a Demonſtration, that no Man ever was, or could be guilty of it! I aſſure you, Sr, this Argument would relieve you in many Occaſions, and be of good Service to many more beſides yourſelf. One very important Conſequence at leaſt

would follow from it, *viz.* that there is no such Thing as *Mahometanism* in the World: For it is a *Religion* fill'd with the grossest *Absurdities* according to the Notion all Christians have of it. We must therefore conclude it is impossible that such wise Men, as many of the *Turks* are, should be serious Professors of it. And it will follow from your Way of arguing, that we make *Monsters* of them only to hide our own *Deformity*.

I have heard of a Book lately printed, which pretends to prove, that if Men had *Faith*, they would be *Immortal*; and that it is a Man's own Fault if he dies; which is so *excessively absurd*, that, according to your ingenious Way of Arguing, I must say the Book was never writ. And yet it is *plain Fact*, that it was writ and printed, and is to be sold by the Booksellers of *London* and *Westminster*. And so it is *plain Fact*, that the *Heathens* worshipped their *Idols* as *Gods* in Spite of all your Arguments to prove the *Absurdity* of it. For the Question between you and me is not, whether their so Doing was *absurd*, but whether it be true in *Fact* that they did so.

G. But, My Lord, *Maximus Tyrius* a *Heathen* Writer, who surely knew his own Religion denies positively, that they believed their *Images* to be *Gods*.

L. Sr, *Maximus Tyrius* is not the only Writer, who overcome by the Strength and Multitude of Reasons against him has been compell'd to recede from his own Principles. But be that as it will, I ask whether *Maximus Tyrius* or the *Word of God* is to be believed by *Christians*? Supposing then that *Maximus Tyrius* is for you, I am sure the *Word of God* is flatly against you. For besides the plain Words I have already quoted from *Leviticus*, and numberless Places of Scripture, which I omit for Brevity's

Sake, the following Text of *Iſaiah* is deciſive. *The Reſidue thereof he maketh a* GOD, *even his graven Image. He falleth down unto it, and worſhippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and ſayeth, deliver me,* FOR THOU ART MY GOD. *Iſa.* 44. ℣. 17.

Nay *Jeremy* charges the *Houſe of Iſrael* with the ſame Extravagance. *As the Thief is aſhamed, when he is found, ſo is the Houſe of Iſrael aſhamed, they, their Kings, their Princes, and their Prieſts, and their Prophets ſaying* TO A STOCK, *thou art my Father, and* TO A STONE, *thou haſt brought me forth.* Jer. 2. ℣. 26. 27. And are we after this to conſult *Maximus Tyrius* to know, whether the *Heathens* believed their *Idols* to be *Gods?* I have hitherto thought the *Word of God* to be *Infallible*; but it ſeems *Maximus Tyrius* is to be believed before it.

However I think you cannot deny, but that *Minusius Felix*, and *Arnobius* the *Philoſopher* are two as creditable Witneſſes as *Maximus Tyrius*. Now the former of theſe (in *Octavio*) ſpeaks thus to the *Heathens. Behold an Idol is caſt, 'tis work'd, 'tis hew'd; 'tis not yet a God, 'tis leaded, 'tis fix'd, 'tis ſet up; 'tis not yet a God, 'tis adorn'd, 'tis conſecrated, 'tis pray'd to, then 'tis a God.* And the Philoſopher *Arnobius* after his Converſion to *Chriſtanity* laments his paſt Folly in theſe pathetick Words, *I lately reverenced O Blindneſs! Statues taken from the Furnace,* GODS HAMMER'D UPON THE ANVIL ----- *as if it had a ſecret Virtue I flatter'd it, I ſpoke to it, I made Requeſts to an* INSENSIBLE STOCK. L. 1. contra Gentes. This, Sr, I think is Anſwer enough to your *Maximus Tyrius*.

But what do you think of the *Golden Calf?* For either *Moſes* relates a *Falſehood*, or the *Iſraelits* worſhipped it as a *God*.

G. I perceive, My Lord, you muſt draw in the *Jews* too, elſe all will ſtand you in no Stead. And

you have no Mercy upon them. You ſuppoſe them « full as ignorant as you have made the *Heathen*. « They muſt believe that the *Golden Calf* on the ſame « Day they made it, to be the *Great God*, who made « themſelves and all the World, and to have « brought them out of *Ægypt* long before itſelf was « made. But the *Jews* will not let this go with you « more than the *Heathen*: They were not quite ſo « foolish. *pag.* 139. 140. «

L. What, Sr! Have you got another *Maximus Tyrius* to baffle the Word of God once more?

G. My Lord, the *Jews* had ſeen *Oſiris* worship- « ped in *Ægypt* under the Figure of an *Ox*, from « which they took their Figure of the *Calf*. And it « was *to ſecure God's Preſence amongſt them* upon the « ſuppoſed Loſs of *Moſes*, by whom they had re- « ceived their Law from God, and Directions from « him upon all Occaſion. But *Moſes* had been ab- « ſent from them 40 Days, and took neither Meat « nor Drink with him; ſo that they thought he had « been quite gone or Dead, and that they ſhould ſee « him no more. And then how ſhould they do to ſe- « cure the Preſence of God amongſt them? *p.* 140. «

L. To be ſure, the Making a *Golden Calf* was a moſt infallible Expedient.

G. They took to this Way of an *Image* or *Sym-* « *bol* of *God*, not that they *forſook God*, but to take « *Care* that he might not forſake them. And they « meant his Worship in that of the *Golden Calf*. « Therefore they proclaim'd the *Dedication* of it a « *Feaſt unto the Lord*. Exod. 32. ℣. 5. And that it was « wholly for Want of *Moſes* they did it (by whom « they had found by long Experience the Preſence « of God ſecured among them) they themſelves « gave the Reaſon. *Up*, ſaid they, *make us Gods*, « *which ſhall go before us. For as for this Moſes, the Man* «

is that brought us up out of the Land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him. pag. 140. 141.

L. Well, Sr, you almoſt make me admire both the *Religious Zeal*, and *ingenious Fancy* of the *Jews*. Their *Religious Zeal* in taking ſuch effectual Care *to ſecure to themſelves the Preſence of God*, and their *ingenious Fancy* in Doing it by the *Image* of a *Calf*. For I own a *Calf* is ſome thing like an *Ox*: and I find I muſt not queſtion, but the *Egyptian Ox* call'd *Oſiris* was but a *Symbol* of the *true God*. And ſo, allowing only for the Difference in *Age* between the *Jewiſh Calf*, and the *Egyptian Ox*, you have proved to a Demonſtration, that the *true God* was worſhipped by the *Jews* under the *Symbol* of the *golden Calf*. Thus with the Force of your Eloquence you have clear'd the World both of *Heathen* and *Jewiſh Idolatry* to make Room for *Popiſh Idolatry* alone.

But, Sr, give me Leave to ask you one Queſtion. Do you believe the *Scriptures?*

G. My Lord, I think I do.

L. Well then, Sr, you muſt drop all your fine Reaſons; and believe *Moſes* ſaying, *He* (i. e. *Iſrael*) FORSOOK *God, which made him, and went back from the God of his Salvation.* ---- *Thou haſt* FORSAKEN *the God, which made thee, and haſt* FORGOTTEN *the God thy Creator.* Deut. 32. ℣. 15. 18. You muſt likewiſe believe the *Pſalmiſt* ſaying. *They made a Calf in Horeb, and worſhipped the molten Image. Thus they changed their Glory into the Similitude of an Ox, that eateth Graſs. They* FORGOT *God, who had ſaved them, who had done ſo great Things in Egypt*, &c. Pſ. 105. ℣. 19. Laſtly, you muſt believe St *Stephen* ſpeaking thus to the *Jews*. *Our Fathers would not obey, but* THRUST *him* (i. e. the *true God*) *from them, and in their Hearts turned back into Egypt, Saying unto Aaron, make us* GODS *to go before us. And they made a Calf in thoſe*

Days,

Days, and offer'd Sacrifice to their Idol, and rejoiced in the Work of their own Hands. Act. 7. v. 39. 40.

Now, Sr, if you believe theſe ſacred *Texts*, as you profeſs to do, you are bound to retract what you ſaid juſt now, viz. *that the Iſraelits did not* FORSAKE *God, but only took Care that he ſhould not forſake them.* For 'tis a flat Contradiction to all the three Texts. *Moſes* ſays, and repeats it twice, that they FORSOOK God: you ſay expreſly, *they did* NOT FORSAKE *him.* Either therefore *Moſes* or you are in the Wrong. Again the *Pſalmiſt* ſays, *that they* FORGOT *God who had ſaved them*; and St *Stephen* tells them, *that they* THRUST GOD *from them, and in their Hearts turned back into Egypt.* You on the contrary averr, *that they only took Care, that God ſhould not forſake them:* which you expreſs in ſtronger Terms thus, *that it was to ſecure God's Preſence among them.* Here then again either you, or both *David* and St *Stephen* are miſtaken. For if it be true, that *the Iſraelits only took Care to ſecure God's Preſence to them*, it muſt be falſe that they FORGOT HIM, and THRUST HIM AWAY *from them.* But if it be true, that they FORGOT him, and THRUST HIM AWAY from them (as I hope it is) then it muſt be falſe, *that they only took Care to ſecure his Preſence among them.* Becauſe a Man, who is only ſolicitous to *ſecure God's Preſence* to him, cannot be ſaid either to *forget* him, or *thruſt him away* from him.

I muſt therefore adviſe you as a Friend to be hereafter more wary what you ſay. For tho by Contradicting the general Senſe of Mankind you only render yourſelf guilty of Singularity or Nonſenſe (which your *Zeal* againſt *Popery* will attone for amongſt your *Proteſtant* Brethren) yet Contradicting the plain *Word of God* is barefaced *Impiety*, which the very warmeſt zeal againſt *Popery* will not excuſe.

But ſuppoſe there were no *Texts* directly againſt you, the very Circumſtances of the Fact, as related by *Moſes*, demonſtrate the Falſehood of your Aſſertion. For, if the *Iſraelits* did not *forſake God*, but only *took Care to ſecure God's Preſence among them*, how could their Crime be of ſo hainous a Nature, as *Almighty God* himſelf repreſents it to *Moſes*, Exod. 32. ℣. 7. 8. 9. &c. Or why ſhould *Moſes* expreſs his extreme Abhorrence of it by ſuch an extraordinary Tranſport of zeal, as was that of his *Breaking in Pieces the Tables* written with God's own Hands? ℣. 19. Why did he reproach *Aaron* ſo bitterly for his Compliance with the People's Requeſt, and call it *peccatum Maximum*, a moſt grievous Sin? ℣. 21. Finally, why did he command the *Levites* to deſtroy to the Number of 23000 of thoſe, who in all Likelihood had been the moſt forward in the Matter? ℣. 27. 28. Pray, Sr, anſwer me theſe Queſtions; and ſhew how theſe Facts can be reconciled with your Saying, that *the Jews did not forſake God, but only took Care, that he might not forſake them.*

» *G.* My Lord (to conclude this Subject of *Ima-*
» *ges*) let me ask you, ſuppoſe it were made *Trea-*
» *ſon* to draw the *Picture* of the *King*, or to *bow* to
» it; would you venture your *Life* upon all the *Diſ-*
» *tinctions* and *Excuſes*, which are made for the *Pic-*
» *tures* of *God*? Yet you venture your *Souls* upon
» it, if it be a *Sin*: tho you think it may be bene-
» ficial to you, as Putting you in Mind of him, or
» Paying Reſpect unto him.

» Now learn by this how dangerous a Thing it
» is to make *Means of Grace* of your own *Invention*,
» and to think that by your *Conſecrations* and *Dedi-*
» *cations* without Warrant of *God's Word* you can
» ſecure his Preſence with you, and procure the
» *Grace* of Health, or any Benefit either to Body

or Soul. This is Turning *Religion* into *Superſtition.* " *pag.* 141. "

L. Sr, I have already anſwer'd your *Lampoon* upon *Conſecrations* and *Dedications* (2. p. §. 3. and §. 17.) and you have ſo ſurfeited me with your nauſeous Repetitions about our Making *Means of Grace*, that I am perfectly ſick of it.

As to your noble Queſtion, viz. *Whether ſuppoſing it were made Treaſon to draw the Picture of the King, or to bow to it, I would venture my Life upon all the Diſtinctions and Excuſes, which are made for the Pictures of God?* I anſwer *firſt*, that your Queſtion runs upon the Suppoſition, that *Chriſtians* are *forbid* to make *Pictures* of *God*: which I have already proved to be falſe; Nay I have proved it from the *Practice* of your own Church, which makes *Pictures* of *God* the *Holy Ghoſt* in the *Likeneſs* of a *Dove*, as we of *God* the *Father* in the *Likeneſs* of an *Old Man*. And let me tell you, Sr, you will ſtand in Need of all our *Popiſh Diſtinctions*, and one more into the Bargain to bring yourſelf off. *viz.* that *Proteſtants* may lawfully do it, but not *Papiſts*.

I anſwer *2dly*, that if any *King* ſhould make it *Treaſon* to draw a *Picture* of him, or *bow* to it, I ſhould conclude him to be *diſtracted*: And in that Caſe I ſhould be as *Mad* as himſelf, if I ventured my *Life* in his Hands by Doing any Thing, that ſhould put me under the Neceſſity of a *Diſtinction* to ſave it.

But you ſay, *we venture our Souls upon a Diſtinction when we make Pictures of God, if it be a Sin.* And do not you venture your *Souls* upon the *ſame Diſtinction*, when you make *Pictures* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, or even of *Chriſt*, *if it be a Sin?*

But pray, Sr, give me Leave to ask you whether you ever eat *blood-Puddings?*

G. Surely, My Lord, you are diſpoſed to be merry.

L. No really, *Sr*, I am very ſerious. For whenever you eat *blood-Puddings*, you venture your *Soul* upon two *Diſtinctions*, *if it be a Sin*. Becauſe *Eating Blood* is poſitively forbid by the *Law of God*. Here then you muſt *diſtinguiſh*, that it was forbid to the *Jews*, but not to *Chriſtians*. But, *Sr*, it is likewiſe poſitively forbid to *Chriſtians*. *Act.* 15. *v.* 29. And this *Prohibition* was never repeal'd by any *contrary Decree*. Here then you muſt venture your Soul upon a *ſecond Diſtinction*: viz. that *Eating Blood* was forbid *only for a Time* whilſt it was an Occaſion of *Scandal* to the *converted Jews*. Thus, *Sr*, ſome Men have their *Conſciences* like *Purſes*, that may be either *ſhut* or *open'd* as Occaſion ſerves. When *Popery* is not the Queſtion you can venture your *Soul* upon a *Diſtinction* as boldly as any Man Living; But when *Papiſts* are to be *traduced*, your *Proteſtant Conſcience* becomes ſo very *nice* and *Squeamiſh*, that a *Diſtinction* will not go down with you.

But I think we have now had enough of *Images*. So let us proceed to ſomething elſe. It ſhall be *Tranſubſtantiation*, if you pleaſe.

§. 22.

Of Tranſubſtantiation.

G. MY Lord, *Tranſubſtantiation* is a meer *School-nicety*, which no Man alive underſtands; and yet it is transform'd into an Article of *Faith* by the *Council* of *Trent*. pag. 141.

L. Sr, *Tranſubſtantiation* is a *School-nicity* like *Conſubſtantiality*: yet this (according to your Way of Speaking) was transform'd into an Article of *Faith* by the firſt *Council of Nice*. And I believe *Tranſubſtantiation* is full as intelligible as *Conſubſtantiality*. But if

the *incomprehenſibleneſs* of a *Myſtery* be an Objection againſt it, I know not what will become of the *three Creeds*.

G. Chriſt ſaid, *this is my Body*; but as to the *Manner* or *Means* how it was ſo, he ſaid not a Word. « Whether only *Sacramentally*, *Figuratively* or *Symbolically*; or on the other Hand, *Subſtantially*, *Conſubſtantially*, or *Tranſubſtantially*: Theſe are Inventions of our own, from our poor *Philoſophy*. « And yet about theſe is our whole Diſpute, which « has tormented the *Chriſtian Church* in our later Age « more than all the other Myſteries of *Religion*. Had « we kept to the Words of the *Inſtitution*, as *Chriſt* « left them, and gone no further, there might have « been various *Opinions* in the *Schools* concerning the « Manner of the *Preſence* of Chriſt in the *Sacrament*; « and they, who had Nothing elſe to do, might have « ſpent their idle Hours, and vain Diſtinctions about « it. But it had never broke the *Communion* of the « *Church*, if it had not been adopted into an Article « of *Faith*, and made a Condition of *Communion*. And « now we muſt diſpute about it. *pag.* 141. 142. «

L. What Pity is it, that the *Church* has made it her conſtant Practice to define *Articles* of *Faith*, as often as *new Hereſies* were broach'd! For, if ſhe had but let every one follow his own Fancy peaceably and quietly; if *Truths* oppoſite to new coin'd *Hereſies* had never been *adopted* into *Articles* of *Faith*, the *Communion* of the *Church* had never been broke; but now they are made *Conditions* of *Communion*, we muſt diſpute about them. This, Sr, has been the Language of *Heretick*s in all Ages, and the *Arians* declaim'd as bitterly againſt the great *Council of Nice* for Adopting *Conſubſtantiallity* into an *Article* of *Faith*, and Making it a *Condition* of *Communion*, as *Proteſtants* declaim againſt the *Councils* of *Lateran* and *Trent* for

Adopting *Transubstantiation* into an *Article* of *Faith*.

But is it not very pleasant in you to complain how much the *Christian Church* has been *tormented* in this later Age with *Disputes* about this Matter? For pray, Sr, who were the first *Broachers* of these *Disputes*? Who were the *Agressors*? Was not the *Catholick Church*, when you separated your selves from her, in as quiet and indisputable a Possession of the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation*, as of any other *Article* of *Religion*? Was there in the Beginning of the 16th Century a *Town* or *Village* in the whole *Christian World*, where it was not publickly taught and profess'd? Was it not defined against *Berengarius* (who likewise subscribed to it before his Death) in eleven *National* or *Provincial* Councils near upon 500 Years before the *Reformation*? Nay was not the very *Word* adopted by the *Lateran Council* above three hundred Years before *Luther* and *Calvin* set up for *Reformers*? If then the *Church* has been *tormented* with *Disputes* about it in this latter Age, the Blame lies at their Doors, who *began* these Disputes. They were the *Boutefeus*, that broke the Peace, and not the *Papists*, who only adhered to the *ancient Doctrine*, they were in Possession of.

However since I perceive you lay your greatest Stress upon the Words of *Christ's* Institution, *This is my Body*; and pretend that they do not determine, whether his *Body* be in the Sacrament *substantially* and *Transubstantially*, or only *figuratively*, or *Symbolically*: before I say any Thing concerning the perpetual Tradition of the Church relating to the Point in Question I shall first prove it from the very Words of the *Institution*, provided you will but allow, that *Christ* spoke *Truth*, and did not express himself *absurdly*. Which I think are two modest Requests.

§. 23.

Transubstantiation *proved from the Words of* Christ's *Institution*, This is my Body, *&c.*

6. TO proceed gradually, I shall first prove, that they import a *Substantial Presence* of *Christ's Body*: and after that there will be no great Need of *Philosophy*, but only of good *common Sense* to infer the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.

That they import a *substantial Presence* of *Christ's Body* I prove *first*. Because all Propositions like these, *this is Bread*, *this is a Man*, *this is the Tower*, &c. (unless you point to their Pictures) are in all common Discourse as currently understood for the *Reality* and *Substance* of the Things specified, as if the Words *really* and *Substantially* were added. Nay a Man would be laugh'd at for a formal cautious Coxcomb, if Pointing to a *Loaf* of *Bread* he should say, *this is Bread really* and *substantially*: or Coming from *Court* for Example, he should tell me he had seen the *King* that Day *really* and *substantially*. Because there is no Difference between a *Thing*, and it's *Reality* and *Substance*. In like Manner therefore when our Saviour said, *This is my Body*, he declared as effectually, that it was his *Body substantially*, or in *Substance*, as if he had express'd it in the most formal Terms. This is the common Language of Mankind. All Wise Men speak so, and all Wise Men understand it so; and if any Man should pretend to mean otherwise, he would deservedly pass for a notorious *Equivocator*, that says one Thing, and means another.

I prove it 2*ly*, if Christ gave not his *real Body*, but a *Morsel of Bread* to his Apostles, when he said, *take and eat*, *This is my Body*, then is follows, that he

call'd a *Morsel of Bread* his *Body*; which cannot be maintain'd without making Christ guilty of a downright *Absurdity*. For nothing can be more absurd, than to hold a *Morsel of Bread* in a Man's Hands, and point to it and say, *this is the living Body of a Man*: it being contrary to the common Practice of Mankind, and the common Laws of Speech, to call one Thing by the Name of another, with which it has no Manner of *Resemblance* or *Connection*: and that too without giving the Persons, to whom it is spoken, the least Intimation to serve as a key to let them into the true Meaning of such an extraordinary and unheard of Manner of Speech. In Effect, it is much the same, as if I should write to you in Cyphers without ever giving you a key to understand me by.

I prove it *3ly*, a sober Man would be ashamed in any serious Occasion to use a *deceitful* Way of Speaking, so as to call a Thing by a Name it was never known by before. As for Example, to take up a Piece of Brick, and say *this is a Diamond*. 'Tis therefore incredibile that *Christ*, who could say Nothing unbecoming himself, should use this *deceitful* Way of Speaking in the most *solemn Circumstance*, and *Action* of his Life: That is, when he was fulfilling the *Types* and *Figures* of the Ancient Law, declaring his last *Will* and *Testament*, and Instituting the most *Venerable Sacrament* of the New Law.

I prove it *4thly* from the Doctrine of *your own Church*: I mean not the Writings of some particular *English Protestants*, who teach the *Real*, and *Substantial* Presence of *Christ* in the *Sacrament* as we do, but your own *Church-Catechism*, which is printed in all your Books of *Common Prayer*, has the Authority of your whole Church to recommend it, and delivers the *Summary* of her Doctrine *Dogmatically*. Now in this Catechism to the Question, *what is the inward*

Part

Part or Thing signified? it is answer'd, *The Body and Blood of Christ, which are* VERILY *and* INDEED *taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.*

This, Sr, is the Doctrine of *your own Church*, of which I will not bate you a single Ace in this Dispute: For it expresses the *Real* and *Substantial Presence* of *Christ* in the *Eucharist* as fully as any of our Catechisms. Nay if VERILY and INDEED be not the same as *Really* and *Truly*, and of full Force to exclude a *meer Figurative Sense*, I confess I am yet wholly ignorant of the Signification even of the most ordinary Words, and it will be impossible to know what Men mean, even when they deliver themselves in the plainest Terms. So that you must either own, that according to the Doctrine of *your Church* the Words of *Christ's Institution* import a *Real* and *Substantial Presence* of his *Body* and *Blood* in the *Sacrament*; or you must suppose her guilty of a most *scandalous Equivocation* in so serious a Matter, and confess she only makes Use of the Words VERILY and INDEED to put a Cheat upon the People, and make *plain Bread* and *Wine* go down the better.

G. But, My Lord, what is all this to *Transubstantiation?* For, allowing the Words of the *Institution* to import a *real* and *Substantial Presence* of *Christ's Body* and *Blood* in the *Sacrament*, this neither determines them to *Transubstantiation* nor *Consubstantiation*, which therefore are meer Inventions of *Philosophy*, and no Articles of *Faith.*

L. Sr, if *Reasoning* from uncontested Principles of Faith be what you call *meer Inventions* of *Philosophy*, I will readily allow *Transubstantiation* to be an *Invention* of that Sort: For it follows by a *necessary Consequence* from the Supposition, that the Words of *Christ's Institution* are to be understood *literally*: That is, if they import a *Real* and *Substantial Pre-*

ſence of his *Body* and *Blood*, as I have fully proved they do.

G. But why do's *Tranſubſtantiation* follow any more than *Conſubſtantiation?*

L. Sr, if *Chriſt* taking the *Bread* into his Hands had ſaid, HERE *is my Body*, then *Luther*, ſetting aſide *Tradition*, would have had Reaſon on his ſide in ſaying that the *Bread* and *Body of Chriſt* are join'd together in the *Sacrament*. But *Chriſt* did not ſay, HERE *is my Body*, but THIS *is my Body*, which nothing but a *Subſtantial Change* can make *really* and *literally* true: For if what Chriſt gave to his *Apoſtles*, continued Bread *after*, as it was *before* the Words of *Conſecration*, the Propoſition was abſolutely falſe; becauſe the Senſe of it then was, that the *Bread* he gave to the Apoſtles *was his Body*; which implies a Contradiction, and is as impoſſible, as that any two Subſtances remaining *different* ſhould be the *ſame*.

It is not then *Philoſophy*, as you pretend, but the plain *Text* of *Scripture*, which obliges us to believe *Tranſubſtantiation*; that is, an *entire Change* of the *Subſtances* of *Bread* and *Wine* into the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt: As nothing but a *Subſtantial Change* could have made the Words of *Moſes* true, if when he threw down his *Rod*, he had ſaid, *this is a Serpent*; or of *Chriſt*, if he had ſaid at *Cana* in *Galilee*, when the Servants brought in Water, *this is Wine*. For, if the *Water*, which the Servants brought, had remain'd in it's *own Nature*, and *Chriſt* had ſaid to the Governour of the Feaſt, *This is Wine*, would he not have ſpoken a manifeſt Falſehood? In like Manner therefore the Words of Conſecration, *This is my Body*, *this is my Blood*, could not be *literally* true, when *Chriſt* pronounced them, if the *Bread* and *Wine* had remain'd in their *proper Subſtance*.

Now, Sr, you may put what Objections you

pleaſe. But pray take Notice, that there is not an *Article* of the *Creed*, which a Man, if he pleaſes may not darken and perplex with *ſophiſtical* Reaſons againſt it.

G. The firſt Thing I have to ſay is, that it is « very ſtrange there ſhould be any Diſpute about it. « For our Saviour was then fulfilling a *Type* of himſelf, which was the *Paſſover*, and he kept to the « ſame *Phraſe* or *Form of Words*, which was cuſtomary with the *Jews* in their Celebration of it, only Putting himſelf in the Room of his *Type*. As, inſtead of, *This is the Paſchal Lamb, which was ſlain for us in Egypt*, he ſaid, *this is my Body, which is given for you.* «

And when *Moſes* ſprinkled the *Blood*, it was with « this Form of Words, *this is the Blood of the Teſtament, which God has enjoin'd unto you.* Heb. 9. ℣. 20. « Inſtead of which Old Teſtament Chriſt ſaid, *This is my Blood of the New Teſtament.* Math. 26. ℣. 28. « In which Words there is no Difficulty at all. For « no Mortal ever underſtood theſe Words of *Moſes* « in a *Tranſubſtantial* Senſe; and why ſhould they the « ſame Words, when *Chriſt* ſpoke them following « the very Form of the Words of *Moſes?* «

This made it familiar and eaſy to the *Apoſtles*, « who call'd many Things *hard Sayings*, which were « not ſo difficult as this; and yet expreſs'd no Wonder or Aſtoniſhment at theſe Words of *Chriſt*; « which had been impoſſible for them not to have « done, if they had taken them in the Senſe of *Tranſubſtantiation:* for it was a new Thing never heard « or thought of in the World to deny all their *Senſes* « at once. *pag.* 143. 144. «

L. Sr, I find myſelf here aſſaulted with three Arguments tack'd together, and I ſhall anſwer them in the ſame Order, as they are propoſed. *Firſt*, you tell

me it was Cuſtomary with the *Jews* in the Celebration of the *Paſſover* to ſay, *this is the Paſchal Lamb, which was ſlain for us in Egypt.* But, Sr, a Fact of this Nature ought not to come a *Begging.* Where is your Proof, that there was ſuch a Cuſtom amongſt the *Jews?* But this it ſeems is wholly ſuperſeded, it being much eaſier to ſuppoſe, than prove it.

However let us ſuppoſe it was a Cuſtom amongſt the *Jews* to ſay at their *Paſſover*, *this is the Paſchal Lamb, which was ſlain for us in Egypt*; this was as *eaſy* and *familiar* a *Metaphor*, as it would be in Viſiting a Neighbour's Garden to ſay, *this Flower grows in my Garden*; meaning Flowers of the ſame Kind. But to make *Chriſt* call *Wine* his *Blood*, or a *Morſel of Bread* his *Body*, and that in the very *Inſtitution* of a *Sacrament*, is ſuch a Violent, improper, and unnatural *Figure*, as never was utter'd by any one in his right Senſes. *Chriſt* could indeed, as he was the *Son* of *God*, change *Wine* into his *Blood*, with the ſame Eaſe as *Water* into *Wine*; but he could not ſpeak *abſurdly*, nor be guilty of an *Equivocation*, which any ſober Man would be aſhamed of. And therefore when he ſaid, *This is my Blood*, he could mean nothing elſe, than that it was his *Blood* VERILY and INDEED, as your Catechiſm expreſſes it.

Your *ſecond* Argument is a very ſtrange one. I ſhall put it into ſome Form of Syllogiſm thus. [*Moſes took* REAL BLOOD, *and ſaid, this is the Blood of the Teſtament*, &c. *and Chriſt took* WINE, *and ſaid,* THIS IS MY BLOOD. *But no Mortal ever underſtood the Words of* Moſes *in a tranſubſtantial Senſe, therefore the Words of* Chriſt *are not to be underſtood in a Tranſubſtantial Senſe.*] Was there ever ſuch wretched Stuff propoſed in a ſerious Diſpute! For the plain *Engliſh* of it this. BLOOD *is call'd* BLOOD *without any Change; And why then ſhould not* WINE *be call'd* BLOOD

without any Change? A Man in the deepeſt Fit of the Spleen would ſcarce forbear Laughing at this Queſtion. Yet it is the Ground of

Your *third* Argument, wherein you tell me, that *the Words of* Moſes *render'd thoſe of* Chriſt *eaſy and familiar to the Apoſtles.* This ſuppoſes, that the Apoſtles reflected at that Time upon the Words of *Moſes.* But I take it to be much more rational to think the Apoſtles before the Coming of the Holy Ghoſt were too dull to make the nice Reflections and Diſcoveries you ſuppoſe they did. However had they done it, it would make againſt your Argument rather than for it. For what could be infer'd from their Interpreting the Words of our Saviour by thoſe of *Moſes*, but that as when *Moſes* ſaid, *this is Blood*, they underſtood *Blood* in the litteral Senſe, ſo they underſtood *Chriſt* in the very ſame Manner, when he ſaid no leſs poſitively, *This is my Blood?* For as they could not doubt but that *Moſes* ſpoke the Truth, and meant what he ſaid, ſo it was the fartheſt from their Thoughts to Judge their Maſter guilty of a *ſhameful Equivocation* in ſo ſolemn an Occaſion: and therefore nothing can be more abſurd than to argue as you do, viz. that the Apoſtles imagined, that *Chriſt* call'd Wine, *Blood*, becauſe *Moſes* call'd Blood, *Blood.*

And why then ſhould the Apoſtles ask any Queſtions about the Matter? the Apoſtles, Sr, believed every Thing Chriſt ſaid with an *implicit Faith*, whether they comprehended it or not. The *Miracles*, they had ſeen him work, convinced them, that he could not only *change one Subſtance* into *another*, but likewiſe that the ſame *infinite Power*, which could make that *Change*, could hinder it from being perceived by their *Senſes.* And therefore when *Chriſt* told them in the plaineſt Terms, that what he gave them to drink was his *Blood*, they had no *Buſineſs* to

conſult their *Senſes* for Information whether he ſpoke Truth or not; but took him at his Word, and believed they received his *Blood* VERILY and INDEED, as you are bound to do, if you believe your own Catechiſm.

As to what you ſay, *that the Apoſtles call'd many Things* hard Sayings, *which were not ſo difficult as this*: Pray, Sr, where do you find this? Have you a Patent granted you to forge and coin *Scriptural Facts* as you pleaſe, becauſe the Badneſs of your Cauſe ſtands in Need of it? Sr, I deſire you to let me know in what Place of Scripture beſides *John. 6. ℣. 61. Chriſt's* Words are call'd a *hard Saying?* But were they the *Apoſtles* that call'd them ſo? No, Sr, but only ſome of the *Diſciples*, who thereupon ſeparated themſelves from our *Saviour*: who Turning to the *twelve* ſaid, *will ye alſo go away? ℣. 67.* and *Peter* anſwer'd in the Name of all the reſt, *thou haſt the Word of eternal Life, we believe, and are ſure, that thou art Chriſt the Son of the Living God. ℣. 68. 69.* Which was far from Calling his Words a *hard Saying:* tho *Chriſt* at that very Time promiſed to leave them his *Flesh* to *eat*, and *Blood* to *drink*. And ſo it is no Wonder, that they made no Replies, nor expreſs'd any Aſtoniſhment, when he perform'd that Promiſe at his *laſt Supper*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THIS very plain that the three foregoing *Sections* contain ſeveral Objections propoſed by the *Gentleman*, which ought not to be paſs'd over without an Anſwer. Yet, as the *Gentleman* has managed the *former Converſation* betwixt his *Lordſhip* and himſelf, his peaceable Antagoniſt lets him run on there

for five whole Pages without Anſwering one ſingle Word in Defenſe of his Cauſe. I preſume the *Gentleman* imagined his *Proteſtant* Readers would interpret his *Lordſhip's* Silence for a tacit Acknowledgment that *Papiſts* have nothing to anſwer to any of the various Objections contain'd in thoſe five Pages. But I hope I have now diſabuſed them in the three foregoing *Sections*; wherein thoſe five uninterrupted Pages are now parcell'd out into ſeveral Heads with their proper Anſwers to them.

However his *Lordſhip* being at length allow'd to break Silence blunders out the following Piece of Nonſenſe in Anſwer to the *Gentleman's* two laſt Lines concerning the *Denying our Senſes*. L. *I wonder you ſhould ſtand ſo much upon this. You object your Senſes and your Reaſon: and yet you give them both up in the Myſtery of the* Trinity, Incarnation, *&c.* This, I ſay, is rank Nonſenſe. *Firſt*, becauſe our *Senſes* have nothing to do particularly with the Myſtery of the *bleſſed Trinity*, and therefore 'tis talking like a Ninny to ſay they muſt be *given up* in that Myſtery. And *2dly*, as to the *giving up* our *Reaſon*, 'tis falſe to ſay we *give it up* in any Myſtery whatſoever. For if we did, *Faith* and *Religion* would be againſt *Reaſon*; which I take to be little better than Blaſphemy. 'Tis true we *ſubmit* our *Reaſon* in Myſteries that are above it: but Submitting in this Caſe is not *giving up* our Reaſon, but acting according to it: becauſe nothing is more reaſonable, than that we ſhould ſubmit ourſelves to *Divine Revelation* in Myſteries ſurpaſſing all human Reaſon, as

has been fully explain'd. [1. Part. §. 51.]

All this the *Gentleman* knew very well, as appears from his Answer to the aboveſaid Piece of Nonſenſe [*Caſe ſtated*, pag. 143.] which being the ſame in Subſtance as what I have now given to it, needs not be repeated here. But the Words he concludes with relating to the *Senſes*, together with his *Lordship's* two Repartees, in which he even outdo's himſelf in Nonſenſe, deſerve to be ſet down.

G. But for the other Point, viz. *that of Contradicting my outward Senſes, I think is an unanſwerable Objection.*

L. Why? muſt you not give them up as to the Trinity *and* Incarnation?

G. Not at all, My Lord. They contradict none of my Senſes. Pray tell me, which of them do they contradict? Is it the Senſe of Hearing, Seeing, *or* Smelling?

L. They are not the Object of Senſe.

G. Therefore they contradict them not.

This is really Overſtraining the Character of a Dunce in the Perſon of our noble Peer, and Expoſing him too unmercifully. For to make him firſt tell the *Gentleman* that he muſt *give up his Senſes* as to the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, and then own in the ſame Breath that thoſe two Myſteries are not the *Object of Senſe*, is ſomething ſo eminently abſurd, that nothing but a Driveler can be capable of it.

But let us now hear what the *Gentleman* has to ſay concerning the Contradiction of our Senſes in *Tranſubſtantiation*.

§. 24.

§. 24.

Neither Reason *nor* Religion *obliges us to* Judge *always according to the* Information *of our* Senses.

6. MY Lord, all our *Senses* are contradicted « in *Transubstantiation.* And I ſtand upon « it, that ſince the Creation of the World, God ne- « ver did nor ſaid any Thing, which contradicted « the *Senſe* of any Man. It would be Deſtroying the « Certainty of every Thing. *Miracles* are *Appeals* to « our *Senſes*, and without Believing our *Senſes* we « can truſt to no *Miracles*, and by Conſequence to « no *Revelation*, pag. 144. «

L. You tell me, *you ſtand upon it*, that *ſince the Creation of the World God never did, nor ſaid any Thing, which contradicted the Senſe of any Man.* 'Tis very ſtoutly ſaid indeed. But let us ſee, whether you can ſtand your Ground.

Pray, Sr, how long was it *before* the *Creation* of the World that an *Angel* appear'd to *Joshua* in the Shape of a Man? *Joſ.* 5. ℣. 13. 14. That *God the Father* appear'd to *Daniel* in the Likeneſs of an *Old Man?* Dan. 7. ℣. 9. That the *Holy Ghoſt* appear'd over our *Saviour's* Head in the Likeneſs of a *Dove?* Math. 3. ℣. 16. And, to omit many other Inſtances, that *two Angels* appear'd to the Women at the Sepulchre in the Likeneſs of *two Men?* Luke 24. ℣. 4. For I ſtand poſitively upon it that in all theſe *Scriptural* Facts the *Senſes* were *contradicted* in the ſame Manner as they are in *Tranſubſtantiation.* Could *Joshua* diſcern by the *Miniſtry* of any of his *Senſes*, that it was not a *Man*, but an *Angel* whom he *ſaw* with a *Sword drawn in his Hand*, and whoſe Voice he heard Commanding him *to put off his Shoes*, becauſe the

Ground whereon he ſtood was *Holy*? And ſo proportionably of the reſt.

But, Sr, are not your *Senſes* alſo *contradicted* as often as you receive the *Body* of *Chriſt* VERILY and INDEED? Do your *Eyes ſee* it? Your *Hands feel* it? Or your *Palate taſt* it? No ſurely. And yet you receive it VERILY and INDEED, that is, *truly*, and *really*, if you believe your *Church-Catechiſm*. And is it not then Talking meer unintelligible Riddles to ſay, *God never did any Thing, which contradicted the Senſe of any Man*? Nay and to *ſtand upon it* with a Poſitiveneſs, which muſt Surprize all Men of common Senſe? Had you not much better own *Tranſubſtantiation honeſtly* and *Fairly*, than to *play* and *trifle* in this Manner with Words even in *ſacred Matters*?

But you tell me, *it would be Deſtroying the Certainty of every Thing*. That is to ſay, if Things ever appear otherwiſe to our *Eyes* than they are in themſelves, we muſt never truſt them any more. Pray, Sr, take Care then never to look at the *Sun*, or *Moon*, or *Stars*. For they all appear to your *Eyes* much leſſer than they are in themſelves. But *Reaſon* corrects the *Miſinformation* of our *Senſes*; and ſo it do's, when *Revelation* tells us, that the Thing, which appears to be *Bread*, is the *Body* of *Chriſt* VERILY and INDEED.

Laſtly, you tell me, *that Miracles are Appeals to our Senſes, and without Believing our Senſes we can truſt to no Miracles, and conſequenly to no Revelation.* The true Meaning hereof is, that unleſs in all Occaſions whatſoever we *Judge* according to the *Information of our Senſes*, no Man can rationally believe he ever ſaw a *Miracle*. Now let us examine the Truth of this Aſſertion from the Circumſtances of a Fact, which every Body is acquainted with.

St *Peter* was impriſon'd in *Jeruſalem*; and the very

Night before he was to be deliver'd up to the People, an *Angel* came to him as he laid aſleep bound with two Chains, and *ſmiting him on the Side* raiſed him up, and bad him follow him. Whereupon his *Chains fell off* from his Hands, and when they came to the Iron-Gate, which led to the City, *it open'd of it's own Accord.* But as ſoon as they came together to the End of the firſt Street, the *Angel* diſappear'd: and then it was that St *Peter* knew *for certain* that God had ſent an *Angel* to deliver him. *Act.* 12.

Here then is a Fact, wherein St *Peter* both *believed*, and *disbelieved* the *Information* of his *Senſes.* For it is certain, that no *Senſation* either of *Seeing*, *Hearing*, or *Feeling* could inform him that it was an *Angel*, whom God had ſent for his Deliverance. On the contrary, had he judg'd according to the *Information* of any of his *Senſes*, he muſt have faln into an *Error*, in Believing that he *felt*, *heard*, and *ſaw a Man.* Yet at the ſame Time he believed his *Eyes*, and had nothing but his *Eyes* to truſt to in Believing that he ſaw *two Miracles* wrought in favour of him, *viz.* the *Falling off of his Chains*, and the *Iron-Gate's Opening of its own Accord.* Now we do not find St *Peter* argued, as you do, *viz.* that *without Believing his Senſes in all Things, he could believe no Miracles.* Neither do we find him Arguing thus. *My ſenſes miſinform'd me, when I ſeem'd to myſelf to* ſee, hear, *and* feel *a Man; therefore I muſt not believe any of the innumerable Miracles I have ſeen Chriſt Work with my own Eyes, nor by Conſequence believe any Revelation.* 'Tis therefore falſe, nay blaſphemous what you ſay, *viz. that without Believing our Senſes* (in every Thing) *we can truſt to no Miracles, nor by Conſequence to any Revelation*; eſpecially when Revelation itſelf obliges us not to Judge according to the Information of our Senſes.

» *G.* It is a needleſs Suppoſition, for there is no » ſuch *Revelation*. pag. 144.

L. No, Sr; You muſt have a good Stock of Aſſurance to ſay ſo after the many *Scriptural* Inſtances I have produced to the contrary. Had not St *Peter* a *Revelation*, that it was an *Angel*, who appear'd to him, when *all his Senſes* inform'd him, that it was a *Man*?

» *G.* But if there were a *Revelation*; if an *Angel* » ſhould appear to me, and bid me believe that I » ſaw him, but not to believe any Thing elſe that » I ſaw of a hundred Things round about him, I » ſhould without more ado either believe that I ſaw » the other Things I did ſee; or if I muſt not be- » lieve I ſaw *them*, I ſhould not believe I ſaw *him*. » pag. 144.

L. Sr, if I ſhould hear an *Angel* talk the *Nonſenſe* you ſuppoſe him to talk to you, I would not believe him. For one abſurd Suppoſition do's many Times infer another. As, if I ſuppoſe you to be a *Horſe*, I may legally inferr, you are no *Proteſtant Divine*. But if *God* ſhould *reveal* to me by an *Angel*, that what to my *Eyes* and *Ears* appears to be a *Man*, is *not a Man*, I ſhould certainly believe the *Revelation* of *God* in flat *Contradiction* to the Information of my *Senſes*. Nor ſhould this hinder me from Believing my *Eyes* as to all other viſible Objects about me.

» *G.* My Lord, I take it for a *certain Rule*, that » we muſt either believe our *Senſes* in *every Thing*, » or in *Nothing*. pag. 144.

L. Now, Sr, you ſpeak out boldly, and like a true *Proteſtant* Hero. But, if this be true, it follows *firſt*, that they, who at our Saviour's Baptiſm ſaw the *Likeneſs* of a *Dove* over his Head, were bound to believe it was a *real Dove*, and not the *Holy Ghoſt*;

And ſo the *Evangeliſts* are made the Authors of a Falſehood. It follows 2*dly*, that the *Women* at the *Sepulchre* acted abſurdly in Believing that they ſaw *two Angels*. Yet they believed it firmly, and told the Diſciples *they had ſeen a Viſion of Angels*. Luke 24. ℣. 23. It follows 3*dly* from your Rule that St *Peter* was groſly miſtaken, when he ſaid, *Now I know for certain, that God has ſent his Angel, and hath deliver'd me out of the Hands of Herod*. Act. 12. ℣. 11. Laſtly, it follows from your *certain Rule*, that tho *God* ſhould at any Time tell me, that my *Eyes* miſinform me, I am bound either not to believe him, or renounce the Uſe of my Senſes for ever: Which if it be not *Blaſphemy* or *Madneſs*, I deſire to know what is.

G. Had not the *Apoſtles* at the *Lord's Supper* as « much Reaſon to doubt, whether it was *Chriſt* they « *ſaw*, or that he ſpoke to them, as that it was *Bread*, « which they *ſaw* and *eat?* pag. 144. «

L. No, Sr, they had not; and the Reaſon is plain. Becauſe *Chriſt* did not tell them, that they *ſaw him not*, or *heard him not*. But he told them poſitively, that it was *his Body*, which he gave them to *eat*. The *Apoſtles* therefore had no Reaſon to doubt of the *Reality* of his *Body*; nor could they believe it was *Bread*, becauſe a *Morſel of Beard* is no more a *Living Body*, than your *Head* is a *Barber's Pole*. Nay you yourſelf, if you will ſtand to the Doctrine of your own *Church*, are bound to believe, that he gave them his *Body* VERILY *and* INDEED. And, if he gave them his *Body* VERILY *and* INDEED, how could it be Nothing but *Bread*, which they *ſaw* and *eat?* Or was it *verily* and *indeed* both *Bread*, and his *Body?*

G. My Lord, if you come once to *deceptio Viſus*, « it will go quite through, and you cannot be ſure « of one Thing more than another: becauſe the Fault « is in the *Eye*, not in the *Object*. So that if *Tranſub-* «

» *ſtantiation* be true, there is nothing elſe in the » World true but it. *pag.* 144. 145.

L. Sr, the *Truth* of *Tranſubſtantiation* hinders no more the *Truth* of *other Things* perceptible by our *Senſes*, than the *Truth* of any *Myſtery*, that is *above* our *Reaſon*, hinders the *Truth* of Things, that are *within* the *Reach* of it. Neither is there any Fault either in the *Eye*, or in the *Object*, but the Fault is in the *Heart* and *Underſtanding*, if it preſumes to queſtion the *Divine Veracity*, and contrary to the infallible *Revelation* of *God* believes that to be *Bread*, which he declares to be his *Body*.

» *G.* My Lord, *Tranſubſtantiation* is no ſmall Pre» judice to this *Miracle* of *Miracles*, and a Contra» diction to itſelf, and to all other *Miracles*, and to » every Thing elſe in the World; that it ſhould be » put upon us juſt for Nothing but to ſtagger our » Faith, and make us doubt of very Thing! *p.* 145.

L. Sr, *Tranſubſtantiation* is a *Myſtery*, which like the *Incarnation* exerciſes my *Faith*, but *ſtaggers* it not, nor makes me doubt of any one *Truth* I know of. Nay, on the contrary, they, who deny it, may with the ſame Obſtinacy deny the *Incarnation*, with which of all *Myſteries* it has the greateſt Reſemblance; and which is both lampoon'd, and as ſtrongly diſputed againſt by *Jews* and *Socinians*, as *Tranſubſtantiation* is by you.

But it is above my Underſtanding to comprehend your Saying, *that it is a Contradiction to itſelf, and to all other Miracles, and to every Thing elſe in the World*; unleſs your Meaning be, that I muſt utterly renounce *the Uſe* of all *my Senſes*, if either *Reaſon* or *Revelation* aſſures me, that in ſome Caſes Things are not what they appear to be. The Abſurdity whereof I have already ſufficiently expoſed.

However I am glad to hear you call the *Sacrament*

of the *Lord's Supper* the *Miracle* of *Miracles*. And indeed it is but Speaking conſonantly to the Doctrine of your *own Church* teaching *that the Body and Blood of Chriſt are received* VERILY *and* INDEED *in the Lord's Supper*: For this is truly the *Miracle of Miracles*. But if in Taking it we receive nothing but *plain Bread* and *Wine*, tis not only rank *Nonſenſe* to call it ſo, but a notorious *Cheat* put upon the People, who will imagine *great Miracles* and *Wonders* are wrought, when every Thing remains in it's *proper* and *natural Being*.

G. My Lord, if all the Benefits of the Death of « Chriſt be convey'd to us in the *Sacrament* by a *fi-* « *gurative* and *Symbolical* Repreſentation of his *Body* « and *Blood*, and that it be ſo inſtituted for this End, « it is to all intents and Purpoſes as Beneficial to us, « as if we had eat the *Flesh* of *Chriſt* off his *Bones*, or « drank the *very Blood* that came out of his *Side*, « which is abhorrent to think; and to avoid which « you call this an *unbloody Sacrifice*. But how is it *un-* « *bloody*, if it be *real Blood*, even the ſelfſame *Blood*, « that was ſhed upon the *Croſs*? pag. 145. «

L. And would you not have the People believe it to be *real Blood*, when you tell them, *that the Body and Blood of Chriſt are received* VERILY *and* INDEED *in the Lord's Supper*? And if it be *Chriſt's Blood* VERILY *and* INDEED, can it be any other Blood as to it's *Subſtance*, than what he ſhed upon the *Croſs*? Yet I preſume your Communicants do not take it in a *Bloody Manner*. But why then is it call'd an *Unbloody Sacrifice*? Becauſe *Chriſt* the *Victim* is not *Kill'd* upon the Altar, as he was upon the Croſs.

As to what you ſay, *that all the Benefits of the Death of Chriſt may be convey'd to us by a figurative and Symbolical Preſence*, I anſwer, the Queſtion is not, *what Chriſt might have done*, but *what he has effectually*

done for us. He might have redeem'd us without *Dying* on the *Cross*, but must we infer from thence, that he has not *died* for us on the *Cross*? In like Manner therefore, tho all the Benefits of his Death and Passion might have been convey'd to us by our Receiving a *Morsel* of *common Bread*, or any other Way, or without any Sacraments at all, if he had been pleased to ordain it so, do's it therefore follow that he has effectually ordain'd it so? On the contrary his infinite Goodness has thought fit to communicate his own sacred *Body* and *Blood Really* and *truly* to us; that is, not *figuratively* or *Symbolically* only, but VERILY and INDEED; for I cannot express it in stronger Terms.

§. 25.

Christ's Body *and Blood are both really and* spiritually *present in the* Sacrament.

» *G.* MY Lord, you yourselves allow, that his » Words must be taken in a *Spiritual*, » not a *Carnal* Sense, because *Christ* himself said » speaking of this *Sacrament* (as you own) and to » solve that *hard Saying*, at which many were offen- » ded, of Giving them his *Flesh* to eat, he made it » easy to them by this Explication; *It is the Spirit* » *that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth Nothing. The Words* » *that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life.* » Joh. 6. ℣. 65. May we not then take his Words in » a *spiritual* Sense? *pag.* 145.

L. Yes Sr, we may; provided the *Reality* of Christ's *Presence* in the *Sacrament* be not excluded by it. That is to say, provided it be consistent with our Receiving his *Body* and *Blood* VERILY and INDEED. Now the Words, you have quoted from St *John*, insinuate such

ſuch a *Spiritual* Senſe, as is neither inconſiſtent with the *Literal* Meaning of the *Inſtitution*, nor the *Reality* of Chriſt's *Preſence* in the *Sacrament:* but is only oppoſed to the *Carnal* Senſe of thoſe incredulous Diſciples, who according to their groſs Imagination knew of no other *Eating* or *Drinking* than for the Nourishment of their *Bodies*; and (to ſpeak in St *Auſtin's* own Words) *thought our Saviour intended to cut off Pieces of his own Flesh from his Body for them to eat, and therefore ſaid, this is a hard Saying.* Aug. in Pſal. 98.

Now, to correct this groſs Miſtake, *Chriſt* ſaid, *it is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth Nothing.* As who ſhould ſay, it is not *Dead corruptible Flesh*, and *Changeable* into the Subſtance of your Bodies, that *profits* in Order to *Salvation:* But the *Flesh*, I intend to give you for the Nourishment of your *Souls*, has all it's ſaving Qualities from the *Spirit* or *Divinity*, by which it is *quickned*.

This is exactly conformable to St *Auſtin's* Comment upon thoſe Words. *What then* (ſays he) *is the Meaning of this*, the Flesh profits Nothing? *As they underſtood it, as it is torn in Pieces in a Dead Body, and ſold in the Shambles, it profits Nothing: But it profits as animated by the Spirit ---- For if the Flesh profited Nothing, the Word would not have been made Flesh, that it might dwell in us.*

Thus St *Auſtin.* And who would not now be ſurpriz'd to find moſt *Proteſtant* Authors as well as yourſelf lay ſuch a Streſs upon this Text, as even to make it the principal Support of their Error? But ignorant People muſt be impoſed upon by ſome ſcriptural Text; and this being obſcure in itſelf was fitteſt for that purpoſe; tho, if rightly underſtood, it cannot furniſh you with the leaſt Shadow of an Argument againſt the *real Preſence* of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood* in

the Sacrament. *Christ* ſays, *it is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth Nothing.* That is (according to St *Auſtin*) *Dead Flesh, as cut and ſold in the Shambles, profits Nothing, but it profits as animated by the Spirit:* And is it not Playing at Croſs Purpoſes to infer from thence, that therefore *Christ's Living Body* is not received *really* and *truly* in the *Sacrament?*

G. My Lord, the *Body of Christ* is *taken* and *received* in the ſame Manner as it is *preſent* in the *Sacrament:* and you yourſelves allow, that it is there *preſent* in a *Spiritual* not *Carnal* Manner.

L. Sr, it is certainly true, that the *Body of Chriſt* is *received* in the ſame Manner as it is *preſent* in the *Sacrament:* And therefore as it is *received* VERILY *and* INDEED; that is, *Really* and *truly*, and *without Equivocation*; ſo it is VERILY and INDEED, that is *really* and *truly*, and without *Equivocation preſent* in the Bleſſed *Sacrament.* But *Real* and *Carnal* are not the ſame. And therefore, tho the *Body of Chriſt* be *really* and *truly* preſent in the *Sacrament*, the *Manner* of it's Preſence is *Spiritual*; not as *Spiritual* it oppoſite to *Real*, but as it is oppoſite to *Carnal.* That is, as it is oppoſite to that *groſs Idea* or Notion, which the Unbelieving Diſciples had of the Meaning of our Saviour's Words. For they imagined he was to be cut in Pieces, and that they were to eat *his Flesh*, as that of common Animals, for the Nourishment of their Bodies.

Chriſt's Body therefore is not *preſent* in this *Carnal* Manner; yet it is *really* and *truly* preſent in the *Sacrament* as to it's *Subſtance*, tho the *Manner* of it's Preſence be *Spiritual.*

Firſt, as to it's *Condition*, or *Endowments:* I mean, it's being *Glorious, impaſſible, incorruptible, immortal. There is a Natural Body, and there is a Spiritual Body. It is ſown a Natural Body, and it is raiſed a Spiritual Body.* 1. Cor. 15. ℣. 14.

2*dly*, as to the Manner of it's being *in Place*; which is not according to the uſual Laws of Bodies commenſurated to, or circumſcribed by *Place*, but more Reſembling the Idea we have of *Spirits*. Thus, when *Chriſt* came to his Diſciples, *the Doors being ſhut*, his Entrance was *Spiritual*, tho *Real*.

3*dly*, it is *ſpiritual* as to the *End*, for which it is received, *viz.* the Nourishment of our Souls.

4*thly*, as to the *Perſons*, by whom it is received. For the *unworthy Communicant* receives it with his *Mouth* only, and therefore *the Flesh profits him Nothing*; but it is *Spirit* and *Life* to the *worthy Communicant*; becauſe he receives it *Spiritually* as well as *truly* and *really*.

5*thly*, and laſtly it's *Manner* is *ſpiritual* as to our *Senſation*, becauſe we have not from our *Senſes* any Information of it's *Preſence*, but only from our *Faith*.

Thus then the Manner of it's *Preſence* is *Spiritual*: But 'tis a *Spirituality* no ways oppoſite to it's *Reality*. And therefore your Argument is of no Force to prove againſt us, that we allow of a meer *Figurative*, or *Symbolical* Preſence.

G. My Lord, there is not one Man in your « Communion, but muſt own that the Words of « Inſtitution are *Figurative*. For Example, *This Cup* « *is the new Teſtament in my Blood, which is shed for you.* « Luke 22. ℣. 20. Here is firſt the *Cup* for the *Wine* « by a *Metonymie* call'd *continens pro contento*. Then « the *Cup* being the *new Teſtament*, I ſuppoſe you will « allow is another *Figure*. And 'tis an other, *it is shed* « for *which shall be shed*; for his *Blood* was not then « *shed*. This laſt *Figure* you have boldly avoided in « your *Maſs*, where it is put *effundetur*, shall be shed « inſtead of *effunditur*, or *effuſum* according to the « Greek ἐκχυνόμενον. However the two other *Figures* « ſtand unalterable. *pag.* 146. «

L. Pray, Sr, what *Figure* is there in these Words of St *Mathew*, *This is my Body: This is the Blood of the new Testament, which shall be shed for Many for the Remission of Sins.* C. 26. *v.* 26. 28. I presume you will not deny these to be the Words of the *Institution*. And if St *Luke* has made Choice of *Figures* to express the same Thing; must *Figures* expound *plain Words*, or *plain Words* the *Figures?*

However that be, I cannot but pity the hard Shifts you are put to, in being forced to make this an Argument of importance, viz. *Amongst the Words of the Institution as deliver'd by St* Luke, *there are some Figures; therefore the whole Institution is to be understood in a Figurative, or Symbolical Sense.* Suppose a Master should speak thus to his Servant, *This Bottle is not good, bring me a better Bottle of the same Wine*; Here is the very *Metonymie* you speak of: Yet I believe the Servant would not be such a Blockhead as to think his Master demanded a Bottle of *Figurative* or *Symbolical* Wine. In like Manner therefore, when St *Luke* uses the aforesaid *Metonymie* in thus Delivering the Words of the Institution, *this Cup is the new Testament in my Blood*, tho *Cup* and *Testament* be *Figures*, a Man must be either very *Weak* or very *perverse* to conclude, the *Evangelist* means *Figurative* or *Symbolical Blood*; and if he do's not, what Matter is it, whether *Cup* and *Testament* be *Figures* or not?

If *Christ* had said, *this Cup is the new Testament in Wine*, would the *Metonymie* have hinder'd you from taking the Word *Wine* in it's *Literal* Sense? And why then should it hinder you from taking the Word *Blood* in it's *Literal* Sense, when he says, *this Cup is the New Testament in my Blood?* You may as well say, that if there be some *Metaphors* in any Sentence, as thus, *the Furnace of Tribulation, and the Rod of Reproof make Men Wise*, every Word in that

Sentence muſt be underſtood *Metaphorically*; which would turn all ſuch Ways of Speaking into rank Nonſenſe; tho they be uſed even in the moſt familiar Diſcourſes. And the Reaſon is, becauſe all *Figures* of this Nature are ſo eaſy and familiar, that no Man of common Senſe can miſunderſtand them, and the foremention'd Words of St *Luke* are as plain to all but profeſs'd Triflers, as theſe Words of St *Mathew*, *This is the Blood of the New Teſtament, which ſhall be ſhed for many for the Remiſſion of Sins.* But to call *Bread* a *Living Body*, or *Wine Blood*, that is, to give Things Names, they were never known by in the World; and *that* in the *very Inſtitution* of a *Sacrament*, and without any previous or concomitant Intimation of their Meaning, is ſuch an *abſurd*, *unnatural*, and *Equivocating* Way of Speaking, that we cannot without Impiety Judge *Chriſt* capable of it.

As to the third *pretended Figure*, which you ſay we *have boldly avoided in the Maſs*, Sr, I either have a Pair of very bad Spectacles, or the *Latin Verſion* has *effundatur* in St *Mathew* 26. ℣. 28. and *fundetur*, that is, *ſhall be ſhed* in St *Luke* 22. ℣. 20. And ſo the *Maſs* being in *Latin*, and many hundred Years older, than the *Engliſh Proteſtant Bible*, has *boldly* follow'd the *Latin Verſion*, which had the Approbation of the *Catholick Church* many Ages before *Reforming* came into Fashion.

G. My Lord, to convince you, that the Words « of *Chriſt* are *Figurative*, and that the *Elements* do not « loſe their Nature by the *Conſecration*, they are call'd « by their own Names *after* the *Conſecration*, as *Wine* « is call'd *the Fruit of the Vine* after the *Conſecration*. « Math. 26. ℣. 29. Mark 14. ℣. 25. And it is call'd « *Bread*, which they eat in the *Sacrament*, and we are « call'd *Bread*, becauſe we partake of that *Bread*, « 1. Cor. 10. ℣. 17. 1. Cor. 11. ℣. 26. 27. 28. *We* are «

» *Bread* by the ſame *Figure*, that *Bread* is *Fleſh*: And » *we* are no more ſure, that *we* are not *Bread*, than » that the *Sacrament* is not *Bread*, pag. 146.

L. Pray, Sr, forget not your *Catechiſm*, but vouchſafe to remember, that the *Body of Chriſt* is received *Verily* and *indeed* in the *Lord's Supper*. This therefore we are *ſure* of. But I hope we are not *equally ſure*, that either you or I came out of a Meal-tub, or were baked in a Oven VERILY and INDEED. I ſhall anſwer your *Texts* immediately.

» *G.* But ſee now the *Arbitrarineſs* of your Inter» pretation. When it is ſaid of *Bread*, *this is Fleſh*, » that is ſo very plain, it muſt be taken *literally*: » But when it is ſaid of *Bread* in the *Sacrament*, *this* » *is Bread*, the Expreſſion is ſo obſcure, that it muſt » be taken *Figuratively*. Is not this Deſtroying the » Meaning of all Expreſſions to take Words *Figu*» *ratively* or *Literally* Juſt as you think fit, and con» trary to the common Uſage, as underſtood in all » other Things? » *pag.* 147.

L. Sr, to take Words *Figuratively* or *Literally* juſt as a Man thinks fit is certainly *Deſtroying the Meaning of all Expreſſions*, and if you will but ſtand to this one Principle, there is an End of the Diſpute between you and me concerning *Tranſubſtantiation*. For then you will find yourſelf obliged to underſtand the Words of the Inſtitution *Literally*; ſince they cannot poſſibly be otherwiſe underſtood but by the moſt *ſtrain'd* and *Arbitrary* Interpretation; as I have clearly proved. Nay your own *Church* underſtands them ſo by Declaring, *that the Body and Blood of Chriſt are* VERILY *and* INDEED *taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper*: to which Words you can give no *Figurative* Senſe without the moſt *Arbitrary* Interpretation in the World: And if Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood* are received *Verily* and *indeed*

in the *Sacrament*, there muſt be either a *Subſtantial Change* of the *Bread* and *Wine* into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*; or they muſt be join'd together; as *Luther* holds.

But, as an *Arbitrary* Way of taking Words *Figuratively* deſtroys the Meaning of all Expreſſions, ſo it is no leſs deſtructive to the Common Laws of Speech to conclude from thence, that therefore *Figures* which are *eaſy* and *Natural*, and taken for ſuch by the Generality of Mankind, are likewiſe *Arbitrary*. Becauſe it is morally impoſſible either to write or ſpeak without the Uſe of *ſuch Figures*; and they are ſo far from *Obſcuring*, that they give the greateſt *Beauty*, *Strength*, and *Luſtre* to any Sort of Diſcourſe. Now then let us conſider, whether Calling the *Elements* by their *own Names* after the *Conſecration* be not *Figures* of this Sort, or whether there be any *Arbitrarineſs* in the Uſe of them.

I prove there is no Arbitrarineſs in it, becauſe it is the common Cuſtom of Mankind to give a Thing the Name of that, out of which it is made. Thus it was ſaid to *Adam* Gen. 3. ℣. 19. *Duſt thou art*; becauſe tho then a *Living Man* he had been made of *Duſt*. Thus the Perſon's Name is given to his Corps; as *Joſeph* deſires Leave to bury HIS FATHER. Gen. 50. ℣. 5. And, *behold there was a* DEAD MAN *carried out, the* ONLY SON *of his Mother*. Luke 7. ℣. 12. The *Serpent* was made by a ſubſtantial Change from *Aaron's Rod*, which even loſt it's former Appearance, yet is ſtill call'd a *Rod*, becauſe made from it. *They caſt down every Man his Rod, and they became Serpents*; *But* AARON'S ROD *ſwallow'd up their Rods*. Exod. 7. ℣. 12.

Thus it is plain we are not guilty of *Arbitrarineſs* either in taking the *Words* of the *Inſtitution literally*, or the Words *Bread* and *Wine* after the Conſecration in a *Figurative Senſe*. Nay Nothing but one ob-

ſtinately reſolved to be in the Wrong can underſtand either of them in any other Senſe.

G. My Lord, *we are call'd Bread* 1. Cor. 10. *v.* 17. And we are call'd *Bread* by the ſame *Figure*, that *Bread is Flesh.*

L. Sr, both theſe Propoſitions, *we are Bread*, and *Bread is Flesh* are *literally* falſe. And if *Chriſt* had ſaid, *this Bread is my Body*, the Expreſſion would have been *Figurative.* Becauſe it is equally Nonſenſe to ſay that *Bread* is a *living Body literally*, as it is to ſay, that, we are *Bread literally.* But *Chriſt* did not ſay, *this Bread is my Body*, but only, *this is my Body*: which, according to the common Way of Speaking, ſignified no more, than that the *Thing preſent*, which he gave to his Apoſtles, was his *real Body.*

§. 26.

Objections from the Fathers *anſwer'd.*

G. MY Lord, every one abounds in his own Senſe, But I appeal to that of the *Ancient Fathers.*

L. With all my Heart, Sr.

TERTULLIAN.

» *G. Tertullian* ſays, *that Chriſt made the Bread his* » *Body*, by Saying, *this is my Body*, that is, *the Fi-* » *gure of my Body.* Contra Marcion. Lib. 4. C. 40. » pag. 147.

L. Sr, *Tertullian's* true Meaning is, that Chriſt made the *Bread* (which before was but a *Figure* of his Body) become his *real Body* by Saying, *this is my Body.* The Inſtitution therefore did not make it a *Figure*, but changed it into the *Reality*, whereof it was

was a Figure before. Now that this is the true Meaning of his Words I prove from the very Subject of his Dispute with *Marcion*, who held that our Saviour came to *destroy* the *Law*: but *Tertullian* proves, he came to *perfect* it by Fulfilling the *Prophecies* and *Figures*; and brings this Instance, that *Christ changed Bread* (which in the *old Law* was a *Figure* of his *Body*) *into his Body*. Which is a plain Proof, that these latter Words of the Passage quoted [*that is, the Figure of my Body*] are *transplaced*, and cannot be referr'd to any Thing but the *Bread*.

G. But, My Lord, the *Transposition* you speak of, is but an odd Sort of *Figure*; and by the Help of it you may do wonderful Feats, and make the *Fathers* say what you please.

L. Sr, I don't pretend to commend *Tertullian's* Stile, or propose his Writings as the Standard of *good Latin*. But *Fact* is *Fact*, and 'tis an undeniable one, that *Tertullian* frequently made Use of that *Figure* out of Respect to the *Word of God*, which he would not interrupt by Interposing his own Words. This made him say *Lib. contra Prax.* C. 29. *Christus mortuus est, id est, unctus*; *Christ is Dead, that is annointed*; instead of Saying, *Christ, that is the annointed, is Dead*. And in the very Book against *Marcion*, C. 2. he writes thus, *aperiam in Parabolam aurem meam, id est Similitudinem. I will open to a Parable my Ear, that is, a Similitude*. Where his Meaning is undoubtedly this, *I will open to a Parable, that is; to a Similitude my Ear*. So that let the *Transposition* be as odd a *Figure* as you please, tis manifest *Tertullian* has frequently made Use of it; Nor can you explain him otherwise without making him talk wide from the Purpose.

ORIGEN.

G. Origen says of the *Sacrament*, that it go's into

» the Belly like other Meat, and ſo into the Draught.
» But ſays, he ſpeaks concerning the *Typical* and
» *Symbolical* Body of *Chriſt* in the *Sacrament*. in Math.
» C. 15.

» It was ſaid of the *Body* of *Chriſt*, Pſal. 16. ℣. 10.
» that *it ſhould not ſee Corruption*. But we know the
» *Sacrament* will *corrupt*; therefore it is not the ſame.
» *pag.* 147.

L. Sr, when I was a Young Schollar, I remember I anſwer'd this Argument by Diſtinguiſhing, that the *outward Part* of the *Sacrament*, viz. the *Accidents of Bread and Wine* will *corrupt*, but not the *inward Part*, which is *Verily and Indeed the Body and Blood of Chriſt*. And, tho I know you to be an Enemy to *Popiſh* Diſtinctions, I muſt deſire you to accept of this for your Anſwer.

As to *Origen*, you have clipp'd his Words, and conceal'd that Part, which fully explains his Meaning. I preſume your Reaſon for ſo Doing is, becauſe the Words, you have omitted, imply the very *Diſtinction* I have now given. For his genuine Words are theſe, *This Food conſecrated by the Word of God and Prayer*, AS TO THE MATERIAL PART OF IT, *go's into the Belly, and ſo into the Draught*, This ſhews that *Origen* ſpeaks not of the Sacrament abſolutely, but with this Limitation, *as to the material Part* of it; meaning the Accidents of Bread and Wine: which he calls the *Typical* and *Symbolical* Body; becauſe the Accidents of *Bread* and *Wine* are a *Sign*, *Type*, or *Symbol* of Chriſt's Body nourishing our Souls.

THEODORET.

» *G. Theodoret* likewiſe calls the Sacrament the
» *Symbols* of the *Body and Blood of Chriſt*: and ſays

that upon their Conſecration they are *changed* in- «
deed, and made other Things, but ſtill remain in «
their own propet *nature* and *ſubſtance*, and *Shape* «
and *Form:* and are *viſible* and *tangible* as they were «
before. *Dial.* 2. *pag.* 147. 148. «

L. Sr, as to the firſt Part of your Quotation, *Theodoret* never calls the Sacrament *meer Symbols* of the *Body and Blood of Chriſt:* and if he do's not call it ſo, he ſays nothing to ſerve your Turn. Do not we alſo call it the *Sacrament* of the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt? And what is a *Sacrament* but a *Sign* or *Symbol?* But I hope you will not conclude from thence, that therefore we believe it to be a meer empty *Sign* or *Figure* of Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood.*

The latter broken Piece, as you have quoted it, is wholly unintelligible. I ſhall therefore cite the whole Paſſage, which is taken out of *Theodoret's* ſecond Dialogue; where under the Name of *Orthodoxus* he maintains the Catholick Cauſe againſt an *Eutychian*, whom he calls *Eraniſtes.* His Words faithfully tranſlated are as follows.

ERANISTES. *What do you call the Gift, which is offer'd, before Conſecration?* ORTHODOXUS. *Food made of certain Grains.* ERAN. *And how do you call the other Symbol?* ORTHOD. *We give it a common Name, which ſignifies a Drink.* ERAN. *How do you call them after the Conſecration?* ORTHOD. *The Body and Blood of Chriſt.* ERAN. *And do you believe, that you receive the Body and Blood of Chriſt?* ORTHOD. *I do believe it.* ERAN. *As therefore the Symbols of Chriſt's Body and Blood are one Thing before Conſecration, but are changed, and made other Things after Conſecration, ſo Chriſt's Body after his Aſcenſion was changed into the divine Subſtance.* ORTHOD. *You are taken in your own Nets. For the Myſtical Signs depart not from their own Nature by Conſecration. For they remain in their former Subſtance, and*

Form and Shape, and are Viſible and tangible as before But they are underſtood to be the Things, which they are made, and ſo they are believed, and they are adored, as being the Things, which they are believed.

Theſe are *Theodoret's* Words. But if any Man can conclude from them that he denies either the *Real Preſence* or *Tranſubſtantiation* without Making him *contradict* himſelf, I will own he has a Talent at Reconciling Contradictions, which I am yet a Stranger to.

The Reaſon hereof is clear, becauſe he grants *firſt*, that the *Gift*, which was *Bread* and *Wine* before Conſecration is after the *Conſecration* call'd the *Body and Blood of Chriſt*. 2*dly*, that he *believes* it to be the *Body and Blood of Chriſt*. And 3*dly*, that they are *adored*, as *being the Things, which they are believed*. Now if this be not Profeſſing the *real Preſence* and *Tranſubſtantiation*, no *Papiſt* has ever made a Profeſſion of that Article of his Faith. Nay *Eraniſtes* lays it down as a Principle agree'd on by both Sides, *that the Myſtical Symbols of Bread and Wine are changed, and made the Body and Blood of Chriſt by Conſecration*, and concludes from it, *that in the ſame Manner Chriſt's Body was after his Aſcenſion changed into the Divine Subſtance:* which Argumentation would be wholly impertinent if both *Orthodoxus* and *Eraniſtes* did not believe the *Change* of the *Bread* and *Wine* into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*.

» *G.* My Lord, *Theodoret* writes, as you have ob-
» ſerved, againſt the *Eutychians*, who ſaid, that the
» *human Nature of Chriſt* was *abſorpt*, or *ſwallow'd up*
» in the *Divinity*. So that there remain'd now none but
» the *Divine Nature* in him, and that he was no more
» a *Man*; and uſed this Compariſon, that it was in
» like Manner as in the *Sacrament*, where the *Bread*
» was changed into the *Body of Chriſt*. *Yes*, ſaid *Theo-*

doret, *it is in the ſame Manner, that is, in no Man-* «
ner at all. For that the Bread, tho changed *in it's* «
Uſe and Significancy, yet loſt not it's *Nature*, but «
remain'd *truly and properly Bread* as before. But had «
he believed *Tranſubſtantiation*, this had been a full «
and abſolute Confirmation of the *Eutychian Hereſy* «
inſtead of a Confutation. For then there had re- «
main'd no more of the *humane Nature* in *Chriſt*, «
than you believe the *Subſtance* of the *Bread* to re- «
main in the *Sacrament*. This explains the Meaning «
of *Theodoret* even *beyond his Words*, pag. 148. «

L. Beyond his Words indeed. For ſurely never were a Man's Words more fouly miſrepreſented. *Firſt*, inſtead of *Theodoret's* Saying, *you are taken in your own Nets*; you make him ſpeak thus, *yes it is in the ſame Manner; that is, in no Manner at all*: Which (beſides the Falſification of his Words) is a manifeſt Contradiction to his Profeſſing immediately before, that he believed the Gift, which was *Bread* and *Wine* before Conſecration, to be *the Body and Blood of Chriſt* after the Conſecration. *2dly*, Your Fixing upon *Theodoret* this Meaning, *viz.* that the Bread is changed *only in it's Uſe and Significancy*, but remains *truly and properly Bread*, is no leſs a Contradiction to his Words immediately following, wherein he declares that the Symbols after the Conſecration *are underſtood to be the Things which they are made; that they are believed to be ſo, and are adored as being the Things they are believed.* For I appeal to common Senſe whether all this can be ſpoken of a Change barely *in Uſe and Significancy*.

I add, that if *Theodoret* meant no more than a Change *in Uſe and Significancy*, it will follow contrary to all Probability, that he has made his *Eutychian* Adverſary argue the moſt childiſhly imaginable. For his Argument would run thus, *as the Bread*

and *Wine are changed only* in Uſe and Significancy, *ſo the Humanity of Chriſt is* really changed *into the Divinity.* Which being moſt eminently abſurd cannot be attributed to *Theodoret* with any Colour of Reaſon. And 'tis an unanſwerable Proof, that *Orthodoxus* and *Eraniſtes*, that is, *Theodoret*, and the *Eutychian* his Adverſary agree'd in this common Principle of their Faith, *viz.* that the *Bread* and *Wine* are by Conſecration really changed into the *Body and Blood of Chriſt*; becauſe he makes it the Ground and Foundation of the *Eutychian's* Argument or Similitude to ſet forth the Change made in the Humanity of Chriſt after his *Aſcenſion* into Heaven. Which is the particular Branch of *Eutychianiſm* attack'd by *Theodoret* in the Paſſage quoted, as appears from *Eraniſtes's* Words.

G. But, My Lord, how is this conſiſtent with *Theodoret's* telling the *Eutychian*, that *he is taken in his own nets?* For if they both ſuppoſed a *real* and *Subſtantial* Change in the Sacrament, the Similitude came home to the Point, and could not be retorted upon *Eraniſtes.*

L. This, Sr, is the knot of the Difficulty, to which I anſwer directly; that the Myſtery of the holy Euchariſt according to Catholick Doctrine contains two Things. 1. That the *Bread* and *Wine* are ſubſtantially changed into the *Body and Blood of Chriſt.* And 2*ly*, that the *Accidents*, or natural Proprieties of *Bread* and *Wine*, as *Figure*, *Taſt*, *Colour*, *&c.* remain the ſame they were before. This latter Truth *Theodoret* expreſſes by telling *Eraniſtes*, that *the Myſtical Signs depart not from their former Nature by Conſecration, but are viſible and tangible as before*; which being a Principle agree'd to by his Adverſary, *Theodoret* had juſt Reaſon to tell him, that *he was taken in his own Nets*, in Drawing a Similitude from a

Myſtery to eſtablish his Error, which very Myſtery contain'd a Confutation of it. For immediately after the Paſſage quoted, he concludes, that as the Symbols after Conſecration retain all their former *natural Proprieties*, ſo the Body of Chriſt even after his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion was *circumſcribed*, *viſible*, and *tangible*, and had all the Qualities of a human Body glorified.

'Tis true, *Eraniſtes* lays the whole Streſs of his Argument upon the *ſubſtantial Change* wrought in the *Sacrament*; as every man, that argues rationally, is ſuppoſed to ſet the beſt Foot foremoſt: but *Orthodoxus* takes the Advantage againſt him from the other Part of the Myſtery; *viz.* the *natural Proprieties* of Bread and Wine remaining after the Conſecration, and infers from it, that therefore the *natural Proprieties* of Chriſt's Body always remain'd; which he tells *Eraniſtes* is *taking him in his own Nets*. Becauſe tho all agreed that the *natural Proprieties* of Bread and Wine remain without their *Subſtance* in the *Sacrament*, no Man ever ſaid that the *natural Proprieties* of Chriſt's Body ever were without his *real Body*; and ſo it follow'd by a clear Conſequence from the very Similitude inſiſted upon by *Eraniſtes*, that the *Humanity* of Chriſt was not abſorpt in the *Divinity*, and that there were always *two real Natures* in Chriſt; the Disbelief whereof was the capital Error of the *Eutychians*.

All this ſhews plainly, how little Reaſon you have to ſay, *that if* Theodoret *had believed* Tranſubſtantiation, *it had been a full and abſolute Confirmation of the* Eutychian *Hereſy inſtead of a Confutation*. For, to ſpeak properly, the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* is neither a Confirmation nor Confutation of the *Eutychian* Hereſy; nor has it any more Connection with it than the Change of *Moſes's Rod* into a *Serpent*; or

the Change of Water into Wine at *Cana* in *Galilee*. But since the *Eutychians* drew a Similitude from one Part of the Myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation* to colour their Error, *Theodoret* had Reaſon to anſwer them in their own Way, and a juſt title to take the Advantage of the other Part of that Myſtery againſt them. So that nothing is more frivolous than what you add; *viz.* that (if *Theodoret* believed *Tranſubſtantiation*) *then there had remain'd no more of the human Nature in Chriſt, than we believe the Subſtance of Bread to remain in the Sacrament.* For you may with juſt as much good Senſe infer the ſame Conſequence, if *Theodoret* believed that *Moſes's Rod* was changed into a *Serpent*, or that Chriſt changed Water into Wine: both which Miracles I preſume *Theodoret* believed without Prejudice to the Catholick Cauſe.

G. But, My Lord, *Theodoret* ſays poſitively, that *the Myſtical Signs depart not from their own Nature by Conſecration.*

L. No more they do in *Theodoret's* Senſe: becauſe the *Myſtical Signs*, that is, the *Accidents* remain the ſame *after*, as they were *before* Conſecration. Now *Accidents* have their proper *Nature* and *Eſſence* as well as *Subſtance*; and the *natural Proprieties* of Things are often call'd their *Nature*: As we ſay, it is the *Nature* of *Ice* to be *cold*, of *Water* to *moiſten*, and of *Fire* to *burn*. So St *Hilary* Lib. 10. de Trin. ſays, *that Fire in the Babilonian Furnace loſt it's Nature.* And in the very ſame Senſe *Theodoret* Speaks, when he ſays, that *the Myſtical Signs depart not from their own Nature*, that is, their *natural Proprieties* by Conſecration.

G. Ay but *Theodoret* ſays more. For he adds, that *they remain in their former Subſtance, and Form and Shape, and are Viſible, and Tangible as before.*

L. He do's ſo. But pray, Sr, take the very next Words

words with them. *But they are understood to be the Things, which they are made; and ſo they are believed, and they are* ADORED, *as being the Things, which they are believed.* That is, the *true Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*; as he profeſs'd to believe a few Lines before. This, Sr, explains *Theodoret's* Meaning, and ſhews, that he takes the Word *Subſtance*, not as it is oppoſite to *Accidents*, but for a Collection of them, as *Form, Shape, Viſibility, Tangibility, &c.* For otherwiſe his Meaning will be, that, tho the *Bread* and *Wine* be *changed* into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*; and, tho the Things, into which they are changed, are to be *adored*, yet they are Nothing but *plain Bread* and *Wine after*, as they were *before* Conſecration; which is both a *Contradiction* and *Blaſphemy*. 'Tis a *Contradiction* to ſay, that *Bread* and *Wine* retaining in *all Reſpects* their former Nature are *changed* and made the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*: And it is *Blaſphemy* to ſay, that *Bread* remaining *plain Bread* is to be *adored*: And nothing can clear *Theodoret* either from the one or the other, but taking the Word *Subſtance* for a Collection of *Natural Properties*.

G. But where do's your *Lordſhip* find the Word *Subſtance* ever taken in that Senſe?

L. Sr, the *Engliſh* Word *Subſtance* do's not bear ſo large a Senſe, as *Subſtantia* in *Latin*, or οὐσία in *Greek*; which is the Word *Theodoret* makes Uſe of in the Text quoted. And therefore, tho it be improper in *Engliſh* to give to *Accidents* the Denomination of *Subſtance*, it is not ſo in the other two Languages. *Ariſtotle*, who as a *Philoſopher* is ſuppoſed to follow the ſtricteſt Laws of Speech, writes thus Lib. 5. *Metaph.* C. 8. *The Word Subſtance* [οὐσία] *may be taken in two different Senſes. Firſt, for the laſt Subject* [and this we properly call *Subſtance* in *Engliſh*] *adly,* FOR ANY ACCIDENT, THO SEPARABLE FROM THE THING. And thus the Latin Word *Subſtantia* is taken by

St *Peter Chryſologus* ſaying, *a glorious Body is changed in Subſtance, but not in Perſon.* Mutaſſe *Subſtantiam*, ſed non mutaſſe *Perſonam.* Serm. 82. and by St *Auſtin* Saying, *Man by Sin fell from the Subſtance, in which he was made.* Per iniquitatem homo lapſus eſt a *Subſtantia*, in qua factus eſt. *Pſal.* 69. In both which Places the Word *Subſtance* is taken for *accidental Qualities.* Which ſuffices abundantly to juſtify my Anſwer. However if you can find me any other *Engliſh* Word to anſwer the full Extent of the *Greek* οὐσία, or the Latin *Subſtantia*, I ſhall be obliged to you for it, and uſe it for the future in Tranſlating the Text, you have objected from *Theodoret.*

» *G.* My Lord, *Theodoret* ſays in the ſame Place, » *that our bleſſed Saviour, who call'd himſelf the living* » *Bread and the Vine, has alſo honour'd the viſible Signs* » *with the Title and Appellation of his Body and Blood,* » *not changing their Nature, but adding to Nature Grace.* » pag. 148.

L. Sr, this Paſſage is not in the ſame Place with the former, but is taken from *Theodoret's* firſt Dialogue. However the principal Difficulty it contains is already anſwer'd. For ſince the *Viſible Signs* loſe nothing of their *Natural Qualities* by Conſecration, they may properly be ſaid not to be *changed* in their *Nature:* And the *Grace*, which *Theodoret* ſays is added to *Nature*, is *Chriſt* himſelf; of whom St *Paul* ſays, *the Grace of God, that bringeth Salvation, has appear'd to all Men.* Tit. 11. ℣. 11.

As to *Theodoret's* ſaying, *that Chriſt, who call'd himſelf the living Bread and the Vine, has alſo honour'd the viſible Signs with the Title and Appellation of his Body and Blood:* his true Meaning is, that the Elements, which of their own Nature are nothing but *Bread* and *Wine*, are *honour'd with the Title and Appellation of Chriſt's Body and Blood*, by being made his true Body and

Blood by the Words of Conſecration: As a Man of a mean Extraction is ſaid to be honour'd with the Title of *Lord* or *Duke*, when he is really made one. And that this is *Theodoret's* Meaning is manifeſt from his own Words immediately preceding the Piece you have quoted. ERANISTES *I ſhould be glad to know why the Names are changed.* ORTHODOXUS. *The Reaſon is evident to thoſe that underſtand the Myſtery. For Chriſt would not have us regard the Nature of what we ſee. But as the Names of the Elements are changed, ſo to apprehend by Faith the Change, which is made in them by Grace.*

I ſhall conclude with a Paſſage from *Theodoret*, where treating profeſs'dly of the *Sacrament*, I preſume he will ſpeak his Mind plainly. *Chriſt* (ſays he) *at his laſt Supper ſhew'd the* TRUE ORIGINAL, *of which the Paſchal Lamb was a* TYPE; *open'd the Gates of the holy Sacrament, and gave his* PRECIOUS BODY AND BLOOD *not only to the eleven Apoſtles, but alſo to the Traitor Judas.---Thoſe Words,* [he ſhall be guilty of the Body and Blood of our Lord] *mean this: that as Judas betray'd him, and the Jews inſulted him, ſo they offer him a very great Affront, who take his* MOST HOLY BODY *with unclean Hands, and put it into a defiled Mouth.* in 1. Cor. C. 11.

Here he declares *firſt*, that the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt* are truly contain'd in the *Sacrament*: and *2dly*, that they are given to all Communicants both *Good* and *Bad*. And let any Man now Judge, whether this be not *Papiſtical* Doctrine. Nay the four *Proteſtant Centuriators* acknowledge *Theodoret* to be an Abettor of *Tranſubſtantiation*. *Theodoret* (ſay they) *affirms dangerouſly, that the Symbols of the* Body *and* Blood *of* Chriſt *after the Invocation of the Prieſt are changed, and become another Thing.* Cent. 5. C. 10. Let us now conſider, whether any other amongſt the Fathers will be more favourable to you.

GELASIUS, and FACUNDUS HERMIANENSIS.

» G. Pope *Gelaſius* ſays, *that the Sacrament of the* » *Body and Blood of Chriſt, which we take, is a Divine* » *Thing, by which we are made Partakers of the Divine* » *Nature: and yet it ceaſes not to be the Subſtance and* » *Nature of Bread and Wine. And certainly* (ſays he) » *the Image and Similitude of the Body and Blood of Chriſt* » *is celebrated in the Myſteries.*

» And *Facundus* ſays the ſame. *Not* (ſays he) *that* » *the Bread is properly his Body, or the Cup his Blood,* » *but that they contain the Myſtery of his Body and Blood.* » pag. 149.

L. Sr, what has been already ſaid to *Theodoret*, will fully anſwer *Gelaſius*; who makes the ſame Compariſon as *Theodoret* did, and almoſt in the ſame Terms. His Deſign too is the ſame, *viz.* to ſhew, that, as the *natural Proprieties* of *Bread* and *Wine*, tho changed into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*, remain after Conſecration; ſo after the *Incarnation* there remain all the *natural Proprieties* of human Nature, and by Conſequence the human Nature itſelf in Chriſt.

But pray, Sr, who has priviledg'd you not only to ſuppreſs a material Patt of his Words, but even to alter in your Tranſlation the broken Piece you have quoted, by Subſtituting *And* inſtead of *Or*? For *Gelaſius* ſays not *Subſtance* AND *Nature*, but *Subſtance* OR *Nature*. *It ceaſes not* (ſays he) *to be the Subſtance or Nature of Bread and Wine*: and he ſeems to have deſignedly uſed the Particle, *or*, to mollify the Harſhneſs of the preceding Word *Subſtance*, and make Way for his own following Explanation, viz. *that the Sacraments by the divine Operation of the Holy Ghoſt paſs into the* DIVINE SUBSTANCE; *yet remain in the* PROPRIETY *of their Nature*: which you have

wholly omitted; because it is rank Popery, and makes *Gelasius* a Witness for Transubstantiation.

As to his Saying, *that the Image and Similitude of the Body and Blood of Christ is celebrated in the Action of the Mysteries*; it imports no more than what Children are taught in their Catechism, *viz.* that the *Eucharist* is the *Sacrament* of our Saviour's *Body and Blood*: Because every Sacrament is a *Sign* or *Image* of the Thing it contains. And the Words of *Facundus Hermianensis* saying, *that they contain the Mystery of Christ's Body and Blood*, will bear the same Meaning. For the *Eucharist*, or *Sacrament* of Christ's Body and Blood is certainly a great *Mystery*; and every *Roman Catholick* in the World will subscribe to his Saying, *that the Bread is not properly his Body, nor the Wine his Blood*: but that they are changed into his *Body* and *Blood*. Have you any more Fathers to quote?

G. Yes, My Lord, St *Austin*, and St *Chrysostom*.

L. St *Austin* and St *Chrysostom* do you say? Then I fear you are in a bad Way. But let us have St *Austin* first.

St. AUGUSTIN.

G. St *Austin* says, *if Sacraments did not bear some* « *Similitude to the Things, of which they are the Sacra-* « *ments, they would not be Sacraments at all. But from* « *this Similitude they often take the Name of the Things* « *themselves. As*, say he, *the Sacrament of Faith, which* « *is Baptism, is call'd Faith.* pag. 149. «

L. Sr, I have more Difficulty to find an Objection in these Words of St *Austin*, than to give an Answer to it. For I do not see what other Sense St *Austin's* Words will bear, than that as every Sacrament is *a visible Sign of invisible Grace*, Christ has in-

ſtituted ſuch *viſible Signs* for Sacraments, as bear ſome Similitude to the peculiar Grace they produce. As *Bread* and *Wine*, which are nourishing Things, and the Matter of the holy *Euchariſt*, Signify the *Spiritual Nourishment* of our Souls, which is the peculiar Grace of that Sacrament; and it is therefore call'd the *Nourishment of our Souls*. And ſo of all the other Sacraments.

But let us now hear St *Auſtin* deliver three Truths diametrically oppoſite to the general *Proteſtant* Doctrine.

Firſt, that *Chriſt's* immortal *Body* is really preſent upon the *Altar* under the *Sacramental Signs*.

2*dly*, that we receive it not only with our *Hearts*, but alſo with our *Mouths*. And

3*dly*, that it is actually received even by the *unworthy* Communicant.

The *firſt* of theſe we have in his *Confeſſions*, where he writes thus of his Mother. *She deſired to be remember'd at thy Altar, whereat she had been conſtantly preſent without Miſſing any one Day: and* FROM WHENCE SHE KNEW WAS DISPENSED THE HOLY VICTIM, *by which the Hand-writing that was againſt us, was blotted out, and by which the Enemy was conquer'd, that number'd our Sins.* Lib. 9. Conf. C. 13.

The 2d. *We receive with a faithful Heart and* MOUTH *Jeſus-Chriſt giving us his Fleſh to eat, and his Blood to drink: Tho it be more ſhocking to eat Man's Fleſh, than to kill it, and to drink Man's Blood, than to ſhed it.* L. 2. *contra Adverſarium legis & Prophetarum.*

And the 3d in theſe Words. *They, who, as the Apoſtle ſays, eat and drink Damnation to themſelves, yet* EAT THE VERY FLESH OF CHRIST, AND DRINK HIS VERY BLOOD. Serm. 11. de Verbis Domini. C. 11.

All theſe are neceſſary Conſequences of *Tranſubſtantiation*, and ſhew plainly that a meer *Figurative*

or *Symbolical Preſence* are contrary to St *Auſtin's* Doctrine.

He adds (in Pſal. 98. ℣. 5.) *that no Man eats the Fleſh of Chriſt, but he adores it firſt.* As likewiſe (in Pſal. 33.) that *Chriſt* upon the *Altar* is offer'd in *Sacrifice. There was, as you know* (ſays he) *formerly a Sacrifice of the Jews according to the Order of* Aaron *in Victims of Cattle, and this is a Myſtery. There was not then the Sacrifice of the* Body *and* Blood *of our Lord, which the Faithful, and thoſe that have read the Goſpel know: which Sacrifice is now ſpread over all the World.*

And is not then St *Auſtin* a very proper Judge for a *Proteſtant* to appeal to? Now let us hear St *Chryſoſtom.*

St CHRYSOSTOM.

G. St *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaking of the Veſſels, in which « the *Sacrament* was put, *in Which* (ſays he) *there is « not the true Body of Chriſt, but the Myſtery of his Body « is contain'd in them.* Opere imperf. in Math. and « Epiſt. ad *Ceſarium*, in Biblioth. P. Col. 1618. «

L. Sr, the Author of the Book you have quoted is not St *Chryſoſtom*, but a rank *Heretick.* And you yourſelf muſt own him to be one, unleſs you will maintain it to be *Orthodox* Doctrine, 1. *that Marriage is of itſelf a Sin.* 2. *that a ſecond Marriage is only an honeſt Fornication:* and 3. *that the Catholick Doctrine of the Divinity of Chriſt is the Homouſian Hereſy:* all which, and many other Errors are ſcatter'd up and down in the Writings of that Author.

The Epiſtle to *Ceſarius* is likewiſe ſuſpected to be ſpurious by the learned. But this all Men of Senſe muſt grant, that if it contradicts St *Chryſoſtom's* conſtant Doctrine in his undoubted Works, it ought to be rejected. Let us then hear *himſelf* ſpeak, and

he will teach us these three considerable Truths

First, that the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* are in the *sacred Vessels*.

2dly, that the *Body of Christ* is at the same Time in *Heaven*, and upon *Earth*.

And *3dly*, that we must not trust our *Senses* in this *Mystery*: tho you told me but a while ago, and were positive in it, that *God* never said, nor did any Thing to contradict Man's *Senses*.

The *first* Truth is deliver'd in the following Words. *The Apostle* (says St *Chrysostom*) *tells us, that what is in the* CHALICE *is the same as that, which flow'd from his Side. And the wise Men adored that Body even Lying in the Manger: but you do not see it in a Manger, but upon the* ALTAR. Hom. 24. in 1. Cor. C. 10. ℣. 16.

The *second* Truth is deliver'd by the same *Father* in the two following Passages. *O Miracle! O Divine Bounty! He, who sits above at the Right Hand of the Father, is at the very same Instant in all Men's Hands.* L. 3. de Sacerdotio. C. 4.

And again; *This Mystery here changes for Thee Earth into Heaven.---- For I will shew thee here placed upon Earth even that, which is most precious and Adorable in Heaven.---- The Body of* [Christ] *the King is the most magnificent Thing in Heaven; but you may now see it upon Earth.* Hom. de *sancto Philogonio.*

The *3d* Truth is thus set forth at large by St *Chrysostom*. *Let us always believe God, and not contradict him,* THO THAT, WHICH HE SAYS, SEEMS TO CONTRADICT BOTH OUR THOUGHTS, AND OUR SENSES.--- *For his Words cannot deceive us, but* OUR SENSES MAY BE EASILY DECEIVED. *He never errs, but* THESE ARE OFTEN MISTAKEN. *Since therefore he says, This is my Body, let us be fully perswaded of it.---- How many say now, O that I could see him in his own Shape! Or his Cloaths, or any Thing about him! Believe me* YOU SEE HIM,

HIM, YOU TOUCH HIM, YOU EAT HIM. *You would be content to see his Cloaths, and he lets you not only see him, but also touch him, and eat him, and receive him within you.* Hom. 83. in S. Math.

And in the same *Homily* he tells us, the Priest's Office is only *Ministerial*, but *that the Elements are Sanctified and* CHANGED *by Christ.*

Here we have both *Transubstantiation* clearly taught, and the grand *Protestant* Objection from it's *Contradiction* to our *Senses* fully answer'd. And had I not Reason to tell you, it would go badly with you, if either St *Austin*, or St *Chrysostom* were to give Verdict. Believe me, Sr, whenever you appeal to the *Fathers*, whether *Greek* or *Latin*, you put yourself into the Hands of Enemies, and must expect to succeed accordingly.

§. 17.

The Gentlemans *unseasonable Boasting.*

6. MY Lord, not to trouble you with more « Quotations, I refer you to Bishop *Cosin's* « History of *Transubstantiation*: where beginning at « the *Institution*, he sets down in every Century the « Words of the *Fathers* upon this Point. A little « Book long since printed both in *English* and *Latin*, « not yet answer'd (that I hear) and I believe unan- « swerable. Wherein you will see a Cloud of Wit- « nesses, through the first Ages of the Church, and so « downwards in perfect Contradiction to this new « Article of your *Faith*. «

And as the *Scriptures*, *primitive Church*, and *Fa-* « *thers* are all against you, so have you Nothing but « an unintelligible *Jargon* of *Metaphysicks*, upon « which the *Schoolmen* ring Changes, till the Noise «

» of their Bells have deafen'd common *Senſe* and » *Reaſon*. Such are their Subtilties upon *Subſtance*, » *Accidents*, *Subſiſtence*, *Moduſſes*, and *Modalities*, » and many more ſuch *Quiddities*; and their *Diſ-* » *tinctions* of *Materialiter* and *formaliter*, *per ſe*, and » *per Accidens*, and a thouſand more to ſolve all *Diffi-* » *culties*, and reconcile *Contradictions*. No Abſurdity » can be named out of the Reach of a *Diſtinction*. » And when we underſtand it not, it operates moſt » effectually, becauſe then we may ſuppoſe there is » ſomething in it. *pag.* 150.

L. Truly, Sr, to hear you ſwagger at this wild Rate, one would think you had an Adverſary at your Feet begging for Quarter. But if you be in this *Gaſconading* Humor, when you ought to be ſenſible, that you juſt come from being driven out of all your Entrenchments, how would you proclaim your Victory with Beat of Drum, and Sound of Trumpet, had the Advantage of any one Argument been viſibly on your Side?

You began the Attack with Arguments from *Scripture*: but finding your own Artillery turn'd againſt you, you made Haſt to call the *Senſes* to your Aſſiſtance, and theſe you bragg'd of as an *invincible Hoſt*. But they were unable to ſtand their Ground againſt plain *Scriptural* Facts, *common Experience* and *Reaſon*. Laſtly, you hall'd into the Field ſome *Fathers*; the greateſt Part of them moſt wretchedly *diſguiſed* or *mangled*: and you would needs force them to maintain a Cauſe, againſt which they all ſolemnly proteſt, when they are allow'd to ſpeak their own Minds. Yet you have the Confidence to tell me with a ſerious Air, *that Scriptures, primitive Church and Fathers are all againſt me, and that I have Nothing in the World on my Side but an unintelligible Jargon of Metaphyſicks*, with a Deal more of ſuch Rodomontado-Stuff.

However I muſt own you have managed the *Fathers* with moſt exquiſite Skill, ſometimes by the moſt ſtrain'd and contradictory Interpretations, and other Times by Suppreſſing ſome *Material Part* of the Text, which might ſerve as a Key to open the true Senſe and Meaning of the Author. By the Help of theſe ingenious Artifices the *Fathers* may be made meer *Punchinello's*, or ſpeaking Trumpets, and in Spite of their *great Age* be taught the modern *Proteſtant* Language, which they were utter Strangers to 1200 Years ago.

But you refer me to Dr *Coſin's unanſwerable Hiſtory of Tranſubſtantiation*, and particularly to his Quotations from the *Fathers*; out of which you thought fit to chooſe to the Number of *ſeven*. And I preſume I may be allow'd to have that good Opinion both of your Judgment, and zeal for the Cauſe, as not to doubt, but that out of the numerous Quotations, with which Dr *Coſin* has cramm'd his Book, you have pick'd the very *Choiceſt*. For 'tis not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that a judicious Collector, who had ſo much Choice before him, would leave the beſt, and take the worſt. Whence it is obvious to gueſs, what Sort of Lumber you have left behind, when the wretched ones, you have made Choice of, are the very beſt of the Bunch. One of your Quotations, is taken from an *Heretick* inſtead of an *Orthodox Father*. Your Mentioning St *Chryſoſtom*, and St *Auſtin* have ſerved for no other Purpoſe than to give me a fair Occaſion to ſhew how flatly thoſe two Fathers are againſt you; *three* other *Fathers* are downright falſified. For *Origen's* Words are *clipp'd* to conceal their true Meaning; and in your Quotations from *Theodoret* and *Gelaſius* you have practiſed the Art both of *Clipping* and *Coining*. Thus, after all your Boaſting, your Quotations turn only to your Confuſion;

And if these be the most *select* ones of your *unanswerable Doctor*, it will be no Rashness to Judge, that the rest of his Quotations are either nothing to the Purpose, or that he has taken Care to cook and dress them with the same exquisite Skill, as some of those you have already entertain'd me with.

§. 28.

Some Animadversions upon Dr Cosin's *History of* Transubstantiation.

BUt, to come to a closer Examination of that Author, I perceive it is his Example has encouraged you to that wild and defenceless Assertion, viz. *that the whole primitive Church, and all the Fathers are against us.* For I find him under the same Sort of *Delirium*, pag. 159. where he tells us, *that Transubstantiation is a meer Novelty, invented about the Middle of the twelfth Century, and confirm'd by no Ecclesiastical or Papal Decree before the Year* 1215. This I own is Laying the Ax to the Root, if the *Doctor* can make Good what he says. For, if he can prove, *that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is a Novelty invented about the Middle of the twelfth Century*, he certainly gains his Cause: But, instead of that, he has deprived himself of the very Possibility of Proving it by what he writes, *pag.* 137. which is a flat Contradiction to it. His Words are these. *At last a new Form of Retractation was imposed on* Berengarius, *whereby he was henceforth to confess under Pain of the Pope's high Displeasure, that the Mystick Bread is substantially turn'd into the true and proper Flesh of Christ.*

Here, Sr, if you can bring off your *unanswerable* Author, you will do him a Signal Piece of Service. *Berengarius* began to broach his new Doctrine concer-

ning the *Eucharist* about three Years before the Middle of the *Eleventh Century*; and one Article of his Hereſy was, *that the Bread and Wine are not changed by Conſecration into the Body and Blood of Chriſt*: as appears plainly from the very Form of Retractation, which he was obliged to make in theſe remarkable Words. *I* Berengarius *with my Heart believe, and with my Tongue confeſs, that the Bread and Wine, which are placed upon the Altar, are by the Myſtery of holy Prayer, and the Words of our Redeemer ſubſtantially changed into the true and proper and Life-giving Fleſh and Blood of our Lord Jeſus-Chriſt.* This, Sr, is the *Retractation*, Dr *Coſin* ſpeaks of, and was made in the *Roman Council* under Pope *Gregory* VII. the 79th Year of the *Eleventh* Century.

Now, if it be true, (as it moſt certainly is) what the *Doctor* tells us, *pag.* 137. that *Berengarius* was obliged to make a publick Profeſſion of the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* in the *Eleventh Century* (in which he lived and died) I deſire to know how it can likewiſe be true, what he tells us, *pag.* 159. that *Tranſubſtantiation* is a Novelty invented about the *Middle* of the *Twelfth*! unleſs a Doctrine can be profeſs'd about four Score Years before it is invented: This I think is a ſufficient Warning to any Man not to believe the *Doctor* upon his bare Word.

But, ſetting aſide the Groſſneſs of this palpable Contradiction, which is no ſmall Blemish in an *unanſwerable Piece*, the Falſehood of his hiſtorical Account may be demonſtrated from unqueſtionable Facts. *Tranſubſtantiation* (ſays the Doctor) was invented about the *Middle* of the *twelfth Century*; yet all the Learned know, that *Berengarius* began to write againſt it about the Year 1047. that is, about a hundred Years before the *Doctor's* Epocha.

Nay his new Scheme of a meer *Figurative* or *Sym-*

bolical Preſence no ſooner appear'd in publick, but was oppoſed by the moſt learned Writers of that Age, and condemn'd the firſt Time in a *Council* held at *Rome* under *Leo* IX. anno 1050. and the ſame Year in *two Councils* more, one held at *Vercelles*, the other at *Paris*. 5 Years after, it was again condemn'd in *two Councils*, one held at *Florence*, the other at *Tours*. And four Years after that in a *Council* at *Rome* under *Nicholas* II. in which Council *Berengarius* threw his own Writings into the Fire; tho (as Biſhop *Lanfrank* fear'd) with a bended body, but not an humbled Heart, *inclinato Corpore, ſed non humiliato corde*. After that it was again condemn'd in a Council at *Roüen* anno 1063. in another at *Poitiers* anno 1075. and in two others at *Rome* under *Gregory* VII. anno 1078. and anno 1097.

Thus was *Berengarius's* Doctrine againſt *Tranſubſtantiation* condemn'd by 10 *Provincial Councils* during his Life; and ſeven Years after his Death (which happen'd Anno 1088.) it was again condemn'd in a numerous *Council* at *Plaiſance*, in which the *Decree* is thus expreſs'd, *that the Bread and Wine, when they are conſecrated upon the Altar, are truly and eſſentially changed into the Body and Blood of our Lord, and not in Figure only*. Tom. 10. Conc. Lab. pag. 502.

Now, Sr, theſe undoubted Facts are *firſt* an unanſwerable Proof, that the *Doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation* was believed by the *Church* in the *Middle* of the *Eleventh Century*; and it could not be *then* believed, if it was *firſt invented* about the Middle of the *twelfth*; that is, about a hundred Years after; as the *Doctor* tells us.

They are likewiſe an unanſwerable Proof of the Falſehood of what he adds, viz. *that it was not confirm'd by any Eccleſiaſtical or Papal Decree before the Year* 1215. For I take it to be an undoubted Truth, that

the *Eleventh* Century was before the *thirteenth*. And I think the *Decrees* of eleven *Provincial Councils*, at some of which the *Pope* himself *presided* in Person, may properly be call'd *Ecclesiastical*, and *Papal Decrees*. So that the *Doctor* is most grievously out in both the Parts of his Story.

G. My Lord, the Word *Transubstantiation* never was heard of till the fourth *Lateran Council* which was held An. 1215. So far therefore Dr *Cosin* has Truth on his Side.

L. But other Words equivalent to it were frequently heard of even amongst the *Ancient Fathers*, as I have already instanced in some, and shall instance in more immediately. But, Sr, are we Disputing about the Word *Transubstantiation*, or the *Doctrine* signified by that *Word*? Has Dr *Cosin* writ his elaborate History only to prove that *Transubstantiation* is a *new Word*? Or was there any Need of fourty Quotations from the *Fathers* to decide this weighty Point? Truly, Sr, tho I have but a very indifferent Opinion of the *Doctor's* Performance, I cannot think him such an errant Trifler, as this would make him.

You know as well as I that the Thing signified by the Word *Transubstantiation* is *a Change of one Substance into another*. And in Relation to the *Eucharist* it signifies *a Change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ made by the Words of Consecration*. And the Question is not, whether the Word *Transubstantiation* be *Old* or *New*, or *when* it was first made Use of to signify that *Mystery*; but whether the *Mystery* signified by it be the *Ancient* Faith of the *Church*. Nay I have so good an Opinion of the *Doctor's* Judgment as to presume he means the *Doctrine itself*, and not the *Word*, when he tells us, *that Transubstantiation is a Novelty invented about*

the Middle of the twelfth Century, and that it was not confirm'd by any Eccleſiaſtical or Papal Decree before the Year 1215.

But, if he ſlinks away from the *true Queſtion*, and means no more than to triſle about the *Word*, I know not where he will find an Adverſary, and I am very ready to grant, that as the Word *Conſubſtantial* was firſt made Uſe of in the great *Council* of *Nice* to expreſs the *Divinity* of *Chriſt* againſt the *Arians*, and that as this was not Coining a *new Article* of Faith, but only a *new Word* to expreſs the *Ancient Faith* more clearly; ſo in like Manner the Word *Tranſubſtantiation* was firſt uſed in the *Lateran Council* held An. 1215. to expreſs the *Ancient Faith* of the *Church* in Relation to the *Myſtery* of the holy *Euchariſt*.

But what is all this to the Doctor's Purpoſe? Is this a Conſequence becoming a Man of Senſe and Learning, *the Word* Tranſubſtantiation *was not generally made Uſe of before the Year* 1215. *therefore the* Doctrine *ſignified by it is a Novelty, and was not confirm'd by any Eccleſiaſtical or Papal Decree before that Time!* If you have Nothing better to ſay in Defenſe of your *Unanſwerable* Author, it will go hard with him in the Judgment of all unbyaſs'd Men. For, as to the *Doctrinal Part* in Queſtion, I have already demonſtrated from undeniable Facts, that the *Doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation* was believed by the *Church* in the *Eleventh* Century, and that by Conſequence it was not a *Novelty* invented about the Middle of the *twelfth*. From the ſame uncueſtionable Facts I have demonſtrated, that, if the *Eleventh* Century was by good Computation before the *thirteenth*, the ſame Doctrine was confirm'd by eleven *Provincial Councils*, or *Eccleſiaſtical Decrees* before the Year 1215. And this is a full and plain Confutation of the chief Article of the *Doctor's* Hiſtory; which was to fix the *Epocha* of the general

general Belief of *Transubstantiation* no higher than the *thirteenth Century*.

But to give you still a more ample Demonstration of the *Doctor's* fruitful Invention, and Skill in *Romancing*, he tells us, *pag.* 131. *that almost all the French, Italians, and English of those Times were of* Berengarius's *Opinion.* And *pag.* 132. *that it was maintain'd by many famous Nations.* A Man must surely have a very large Stock of Confidence to assert two Facts so notoriously false. For, *First*, if almost all the *French, Italians*, and *English* held *Berengarius's* Doctrine, and if it was maintain'd by *many famous Nations*, how came it to pass, that in the very Age he lived in, there were *eleven Provincial Councils* call'd to condemn it, and not one to approve or defend it either in *Italy*, *France*, or *England*, or any other Nation of the known World! Were all the *famous Nations*, the *Doctor* speaks of, intoxicated with Wine, or laid fast asleep with *Opium*, that they could not stand up for the common Cause of *Religion*, nor oppose *Councils* against *Councils* to support the sinking Credit of their Champion, and save him from being run down by Numbers! Or must we suppose it to be the common Practice of *Bishops* to define a Doctrine contrary to their own Conscience and Belief! Such pretty Suppositions as these may indeed relieve the *Doctor* in some Measure: But without their Help 'tis impossible for any Man in his right Senses to believe, that *many famous Nations*, nay even one single *famous Nation* was for *Berengarius*, when there are no noted Facts to render it credible, and innumerable ones to disprove it.

2*dly*, If *Berengarius* asserted the *ancient Doctrine*, and had so *many famous Nations* for him, I ask, whether the *Greeks* were of the Number of these *famous Nations*? For I am sure the *Western Nations* were all

againſt him. And if the *Greeks* were for him, why did they not engage openly in his Quarrel? They were at that Time ſo exaſperated againſt the *Latins*, that they even reproach'd them with the moſt trivial Things, as *Shaving their Beards*, *Eating Hogs-flesh*, and *Conſecrating in unleaven'd Bread*; but never accuſed them of any Error relating to the ſubject in Queſtion: which is a Demonſtrative Proof, that the *Greeks* agree'd with the *Latins*, and were againſt *Berengarius* in this *Myſtery*.

3*dly*, the moſt learned Writers of the *Eleventh* Age knew nothing of the *many famous Nations*, the *Doctor* ſpeaks of; and I may modeſtly preſume, they could not be ignorant of the *Religion* profeſs'd in any *noted* Nation of *Chriſtendom*.

Hugh Bishop of *Langres* in *France* writing to *Berengarius*, told him, that he Scandaliz'd the whole Church: *Univerſalem Eccleſiam ſcandalizas*.

Durandus Abbot of *Troarn* in *Normandy* told him, he impugn'd the Doctrine of the whole Catholick Church. *Quod Catholica per Orbem univerſum pradicat Eccleſia*.

Lanfrank Primate of *England*, and a Man of extraordinary Parts in the Beginning of his Book againſt *Berengarius* tells him he holds an Opinion contrary to the whole World. *Contra Orbem ſentire capiſti*. And *Guitmond* Abbot of *Averſe* told him, he was the *Author* of his Sect. *It is* (ſays he) *notoriouſly known at this Time, that this mad Doctrine never was taught, before* Berengarius *began to run Mad*. L. 3. *Notiſſimum eſt hoc tempore, priuſquam* Berengarius *inſaniſſet, hujuſmodi inſanias nunquam fuiſſe*. And in the ſame Book he reproaches him, that not even any *poor Town* or *Village* had received his Doctrine: *neque enim eis vel una Civitatula vel Villa conceſſit*. And pray, Sr, in what Part of the Terreſtrial Globe were

then the *many famous Nations* discover'd since by your *unanswerable* Doctor?

§. 29.

The Antiquity *of the* Doctrine *of* Transubstantiation.

BUt, to return to that Piece of Doctor *Cosin's* History, where he tells us, *that Transubstantiation was first invented about the Middle of the twelfth Century*, I shall now produce some Testimonies of Fathers, that lived in the *Fourth*: and if these teach the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* as plainly as *Bellarmin* himself, then the *Doctor* must stand condemned. I have already fairly proved St *Austin* and St *Chrysostom* to be sound *Papists* in Relation to the Article in Question. To these I shall for Brevity's Sake only add four more, two *Greek*, and two *Latin* Fathers (for I omit a whole Cloud more of Venerable Witnesses) *viz.* St *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, St *Gregory Nyssen*, St *Ambrose*, and St *Jerom*. Whoever cannot find the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation* in these Fathers, must have very bad Eyes. I say the *Doctrine*; for I am not disposed to trifle about the *Word*.

St *Cyril* (Catech. Mystag. 4.) writes thus. *Jesus Christ* (says he) *in Cana of Galilee changed Water into Wine, which has some Affinity with Blood, by his Will only. And can we not believe him,* THAT HE CHANGED THE WINE INTO HIS OWN BLOOD? ----- *Let your Soul rejoice in the Lord being persuaded of it as a Thing most certain, that the Bread, which appears to our Eyes, is not Bread, tho our Tast do Judge it to be so, but that it is the Body of* Jesus Christ. *And that the Wine, which appears to our Eyes is not Wine, tho our Sense of Tast judges it for Wine, but that it is the Blood of* Jesus Christ. Nothing can be plainer than this.

St *Gregory Nyſſen* in the ſame Century having ſaid, *that the immortal Body of* Chriſt *(as a powerful Preſervative) is received into our Bowels*, and then enquired, *how this ſame Body, which is diſtributed to ſo many thouſands of the Faithful over all the Earth, ſhould be entire in each of theſe, and in each Part, which they receive, and yet not ceaſe to remain entire in itſelf?* He anſwers, becauſe the viſible *Subſtance* of *Bread* and *Wine* are *changed* into it. *The Body of* Chriſt, ſays he, *is Deify'd by his Perſon. And therefore I have Reaſon to believe, that to this Day the Bread being ſanctify'd by the Word of God* IS CHANGED INTO THE BODY OF GOD THE SON. --- *For there the Divine Perſon ſanctify'd the Body, which had Bread for it's Nourihment, and ſo was as it were Bread. And here in like Manner, Bread, to uſe the Words of the Apoſtle, is ſanctify'd by the Word of God and Prayer. Not ſo, that it is to be changed into the Body of* Chriſt *by Nourishing it*; BUT THAT IT IS SUDDENLY CHANGED INTO IT BY THESE WORDS, *this is my Body*; THE NATURE OF THOSE THINGS, THAT APPEAR, BEING TRANSELEMENTED INTO IT BY THE POWER OF CONSECRATION. In Orat. Catech. Cap. 37. T. 3. Edit. Par.

This I think is Teaching the *Doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation*, tho the Word itſelf be not made Uſe of.

St *Ambroſe* likewiſe teaches it ſo very plainly, that the *Proteſtant Centuriſts* made bold to give him a Reprimand for it, ſaying, *Ambroſe did not write well of Tranſubſtantiation.* Cent. 4. C. 4. Col. 295. It ſeems then he wrote of it; and ſince he lived above 700 Years before the middle of the *twelfth* Century, I know not what will become of Doctor *Coſin's Epocha.*

Let us then ſee, how he handles this Subject in his Book *de Initiatis. Perhaps*, ſays he, *you may tell me I ſee another Thing.* --- *I muſt therefore prove, that*

what you receive, is not that which Nature framed, but that, which the Benediction has conſecrated; and that the Benediction has a greater Force than Nature. Moſes *held a Rod in his Hand, he threw it down, and it was made a Serpent. Again he took hold of the Serpent, and it return'd into the nature of a Rod.--- The Rivers of Egypt ran with Streams of pure Water, when preſently Blood guſh'd forth out of the Fountain. There was no Water in the Rivers, and again at the Prayer of* Moſes *the Blood ceaſed, and the Nature of Waters return'd.---*

To thoſe he adds other Miracles: *viz.* that when *Moſes* held up his Rod, the Sea open'd a Paſſage for the *Iſraelits*. That *Jordan* ran back. That *Moſes* brought Water out of a Rock by Striking it; and that *Eliſha* made Iron Swim upon the Water contrary to it's Nature. Then he go's on thus. *We ſee therefore that Grace is ſtronger than Nature. Now, if a Man's Bleſſing could change the Courſe of Nature, what do we think of the Divine Conſecration itſelf, in which the very Words of our Saviour operate? For the Sacrament, which you receive, is made by the Words of Chriſt. And if Eliſha's Words were able to draw Fire from Heaven, will not Chriſt's Words* BE ABLE TO CHANGE THE SPECIES OF THE ELEMENTS? *We read of all Creatures in the World,* he ſaid and they were made, he commanded, and they were created: *Is not then the Word of* Chriſt, *which could give a Being to that, which had none, able to* CHANGE THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE, INTO WHAT THEY WERE NOT BEFORE? *For it is not leſs* TO GIVES NEW NATURES TO THINGS, THAN TO CHANGE THEIR NATURES.

Laſtly St *Jerom* Epiſt. ad *Heliod.* writes thus. *God forbid I ſhould ſpeak detractingly of thoſe Men* [Biſhops] *who ſucceeding the Apoſtles in their Functions do* MAKE THE BODY OF CHRIST *with their ſacred Mouth.*

These certainly are Authentick Witnesses of the *publick Faith* of the *Church* in their Times, both in Regard of their *Holiness* and *Learning*; and becaufe they never were accufed by the *Church* of any Error againſt Faith; which Cenſure they could not have eſcaped, had they been guilty of Broaching any Doctrine contrary to the *known Faith* of the *Univerſal Church*. Whence it is plain, that they taught no other Doctrine, than what they had received by a *conſtant Tradition* from the *Apoſtles*: for otherwiſe they would undoubtedly have been publickly cenſured for Introducing *Novelties* into the *Church*.

Even many *Proteſtants* convinced by theſe, and other numberleſs Teſtimonies of the *Ancient Fathers* have own'd the *Antiquity* of *Tranſubſtantiation*. For beſides the *Centuriſts*, who blame ſeveral Fathers by Name for teaching it, *Adamus Franciſci* (marg. Theol. *p.* 256.) confeſſes *that Tranſubſtantiation enter'd early into the Church*. And *Antonius de Adamo* another *Proteſtant* Writer (Anat. Miſſ. *p.* 36.) fairly owns, *that he has not hitherto been able to know, when this Opinion of the real, and bodily Being of Chriſt in the Sacrament did begin*. Which according to St *Auſtin's* Maxim againſt the *Donatiſts*, is Owning in Effect, that it had it's Beginning from *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles*.

Hence I may fairly conclude, that Doctor *Cofin's* Calling *Tranſubſtantiation* a *Novelty invented about the Middle of the twelfth Century*, and your telling me, *that the Primitive Church and Fathers are all againſt it*, are two Aſſertions wholly void of Truth.

St *Ignatius* Biſhop of *Antioch* in the very firſt Age a *Diſciple* of the *Apoſtles*, and an illuſtrious *Martyr*, is alone ſufficient to diſprove both the *Doctor*, and yourſelf; and give us certain Information of what the *Primitive* Church believed and taught concerning the *Euchariſt*. For in his Genuine Epiſtle to the Church

of *Smyrna* he has these remarkable Words (quoted also by *Theodoret*) of the *Heretieks* of his Time. *They do not admit Eucharists and Oblations, because they do not confess*, THAT THE EUCHARIST IS THE FLESH OF OUR SAVIOUR JESUS-CHRIST, WHICH SUFFER'D FOR OUR SINS, AND WHICH THE FATHER RAISED AGAIN BY HIS BOUNTY.

§. 30.

Transubstantiation *not repugnant to the current Principles of* Philosophy.

G. MY Lord, you have repeated many Times that the *Substance* of *Bread* and *Wine* are changed into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, but that the *Accidents* of both remain.

L. Well, Sr, what then?

G. Then I ask, whether you know the Difference betwixt *Substance* and *Accident?* pag. 150. «

L. Sr, when I was a Boy, I was taught to answer, that *Substance* is *a Being which subsists by itself*. And that the *Essence* of an *Accident* is not *actual Inhesion*, but a *natural Exigency* to inhere. So that, tho by a *Supernatural* Power it may exist without any *Subject*, it still retains it's *Essence*, because it naturally requires a *Subject*, even when it exists without one.

G. My Lord, this seems to be a *Philosophical Scheme* cook'd up expressly to make the hard Morsel of *Transubstantiation* go down the better.

L. Sr, I believe the Cookery do's not please your Palate. However 'tis good sound *Aristotelian Philosophy*. And *Aristotle* (who lived long enough before *Transubstantiation* was known in the World) could not easily be bribed by *Papists* to come in to their

Notions. Now he taught expresly, that *Accidents* are really distinguish'd, and may consequently by a *Supernatural* Power be *Separated* from their *Substance*; as we say they are in the *Sacrament* of the *holy Eucharist*. And so we cannot be said to have made a *precarious* Philosophical Scheme in Favour of *Transubstantiation*: since we only maintain, that it is not repugnant to current principles held for many hundred Years before Christianity was establish'd.

G. My Lord, when the *Substance* of Bread is gone, how can the *Figure*, and *Colour*, and *Taste* of it remain? » For then there will be *Accidents* of *Nothing*. » There will be *Roundness*, and *Nothing round*; *Whiteness*, and *Nothing White*; a *Taste*, and *Nothing tasted*; » Which is ridiculous. *pag.* 151.

L. It is so, Sr; if *Quantity* be *Nothing*. But *Quantity* according to *Aristotle's* Philosophy is a *Physical Accident* distinct, and by Consequence *separable* from *Substance*; and it is the immediate Subject of the other *Accidents* mention'd by you; which in Reality are but so many different *Modifications* of *Quantity*: And therefore cannot be destitute of their *proper Subject*, whether *Quantity* be join'd to, or *separated* from it's *Substance*; as it is in the *Sacrament* of the *holy Eucharist*.

» *G.* My Lord, if *Quantity*, and other *Accidents* » subsist by themselves, why are they not *Substances*? » For that is the Definition you give of *Substance*. » pag. 151. 152.

L. Sr, the Reason is, because they do not subsist *naturally* by themselves, as *Substance* do's, but only by a supernatural Power.

» *G.* But if it be by *Miracle*, that they stand by » themselves, then by *Miracle* they are *Substances*, » and there is an End of the *Jargon*. pag. 152.

L. Sr, I hope there is. For I have already told you,

you, that their *Essence* according to *Aristotle's* Philosophy (which I think you have not yet confuted) is not an *actual Inhesion*, but a *Natural Exigency* of it, which remains when they are *miraculously* separated from their *Substance*. And therefore, good Sr, the *Miracle*, by which they are thus *separated*, do's not convert them into *Substances*.

G. If your Lordship be in earnest about this *Logick* of *Substance* and *Accidents*, will you lay a good Wager upon it? *pag.* 153. "

L. Hudibras says, *Fools for Arguments lay Wagers.*

G. Yet you have laid all your *Honour* and *Estate* upon it. But are you so sure of it, that you would take your *Oath* upon it? *pag.* 153. "

L. Whatever you may fancy, Sr, I do not know that I hazard the Value of a Farthing upon the *Logical* Question of *Substance* and *Accidents*.

G. That's very strange, My Lord. Is it not a Point of *Faith* with you, that the *Accidents* of *Bread* and *Wine* remain after the *Consecration*?

L. It is, Sr; if by *Accidents* you mean the *Signs* or *Appearances* of *Bread* and *Wine*. But whether those *Signs* or *Appearances* be true *Physical Accidents*, or only *Modifications* of the Object, or such Impressions made upon our outward Senses by the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, as *Bread* and *Wine*, if they had been present, would have made; are meer *School-Questions*, upon which I shall never be disposed to hazard either my *Honour* or *Estate*, much less pawn my *Soul* upon the Truth or Certainty of them; the Faith of the Church being not the least concern'd in them.

G. But, My Lord, did you not just now defend *Transubstantiation* by the *Philosophical* Distinction between *Substance* and *Accidents*?

L. But, Sr, do you make no Difference between Building *Faith* upon *Philosophy*, and shewing that

the one is not repugnant to the other? I believe all *Myſteries* of *Faith* purely upon *Divine Revelation*, and not upon their *Non-repugnance* to human Reaſon, which only ſhews them to be *poſſible*. But if a Man be ſuch a Trifler as to muſter up Boyish Arguments from *Philoſophy* againſt them, am I not *a Debtor to the Wiſe and to the Unwiſe*, and bound to ſhew that *Chriſtianity* and *Philoſophy* are not irreconcilable? And for this Reaſon I have inſiſted upon the *Ariſtotelian* Diſtinction of *Accidents* and *Subſtance:* Not that the Myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation* is built upon that *Philoſophical* Diſtinction, or depends upon it, but only to convince you, that it is not repugnant to the *current Principles* of *Philoſophy*.

» *G.* My Lord, this is that *Philoſophy*, and *vain* » *Deceit* or *Fallacy*, which the *Apoſtle* ſays will *ſpoil* » or hurt our *Faith*. *Doting upon Queſtions and Strifes* » *of Words --- perverſe Diſputings --- and Oppoſitions of* » *Science falſely ſo call'd*, which *ſome profeſſing have* » *err'd concerning the Faith*. Cor. 2. ℣. 8. 1. Tim. 6. » ℣. 4. 5. 21. 22. pag. 153.

L. Sr, the *Apoſtle* cenſures thoſe, who draw Arguments from *Philoſophy* to overthrow, or ridicule the ſacred Myſteries of *Chriſtian Religion*. So that you have only provided a Scourge for your own Back; and, if you will but conſider yourſelf attentively in the Looking-glaſs St *Paul* has ſet before you, it will diſcover to you the weak Condition of your Cauſe. I have proved *Tranſubſtantiation* from *Scriptures*, and the unqueſtionable *Tradition* of the *Church*. And what do you oppoſe againſt theſe ſolid Proofs but Arguments from *human Reaſon*, the Teſtimony of our *Senſes*, and poor Trifles of *Philoſophy*, which the Apoſtle juſtly calls, *Doting upon Queſtions and Strifes of Words*, *perverſe Diſputings*, *and Oppoſition of Science falſely ſo call'd*? Theſe are the Arguments, with which

you attack us; and when we have the Condeſcenſion to take Notice of them, and oppoſe *Philoſophy* againſt *Philoſophy* (which indeed is more than you can in Rigour oblige us to in *Controverſies* of *Faith*) you cry out, *that we have nothing but an unintelligible Jargon of Metaphyſicks on our Side.* As if *Philoſophy* were intended only to run down *Chriſtian Religion*, and it were an Abuſe to employ any Part of it in it's Service.

ADVERTISEMENT.

N. B. that the *Gentleman's* whole Reply to the notorious Nonſenſe, he has made his *Catholick Lord* ſpeak in his *Caſe ſtated*, pag. 151. can only be uſher'd in by the Nonſenſe itſelf which it confutes. This is the Reaſon, why a great Part of *pag.* 151, 152, 153. is here omitted. For tho his *Lordſhip* has now anſwer'd every Thing, that looks like an Objection in thoſe Pages; it was impoſſible to repeat Word for Word all the *Gentleman's* fine Drollery contain'd in them without making his *Lordſhip* perſonate the Dunce as effectually as he do's in the former Converſation. For he is there made to anſwer, *pag.* 151. that *actual Inherence*, or *Inſticking* (to render the Farce more ridiculous) is the *Eſſence of Accidents.* And the *Gentleman* taking the Advantage of his Blunder draws Conſequences from it, and plays moſt unmercifully upon him. If any one has ſo much Idle Time to throw away, he may read the forementioned Pages in the *Gentleman's Caſe ſtated*, Where he will ſee how poorly his *Lordſhip* comes off at laſt; when weary of being pelted with hard

Words, and unable to reſiſt the *Gentleman's* powerful *Logick*, he asks Quarter, and begs Leave *to believe as the Church believes*. To which his triumphant adverſary anſwers in the following Manner.

§. 31.

Of implicit Faith.

» *G.* CAn you believe what the *Church* believes » without knowing what she believes? This » is Believing Nothing. It is *implicit indeed!* At this » Rate you need but one Article of your *Creed*, to » believe the *Holy Catholick Church*. And all the Reſt » may go off *implicitly*, tho you should know No- » thing of any other of the *Articles*. And what a Man » knows nothing of, he can give no *Reaſon* for. But » St *Peter* bids us *be ready always to give an Anſwer to* » *every Man that asketh us a Reaſon of the Hope* (or » Faith) *that is in us*. Which ſuppoſes our Under- » ſtanding it ourſelves, and not an *implicit* Faith » in others of we know not what. So that if you » make *Tranſubſtantiation* an *Article* of your *Faith*, » you are obliged to underſtand it aright. *pag.* 154.

L. Sr, I think I do underſtand it aright; For I know that the *Tranſubſtantiation*, which the *Church* believes, is *a Change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Chriſt made by the Words of Conſecration*. And this is as much as I need to *know* or *underſtand* for my *Belief* of it: And neither you, nor the wiſeſt Man upon Earth knows any more in Proportion of the *dark Myſteries* of the *bleſſed Trinity*, the *Incarnation*, the *Propagation* of *Original Sin*, and ſuch other Articles of *Faith*, which we both equally believe and profeſs. Yet I bleſs God *I shall always be*

ready to give an Anſwer to every Man, that asketh me, a Reaſon of my Faith, or *Belief* of theſe Myſteries: And the Anſwer I am ready to give is, becauſe *God has reveal'd them*; and the Church, which is *the Ground and Pillar of Truth*, teaches them. And whoever is not ſatisfied with this Anſwer, muſt bid Adieu to Chriſtianity.

You ſay, this is Believing with *implicit Faith*. And I ſay, there is not a Chriſtian in the World, let him be as wiſe and learned as he will, but is bound to believe innumerable Things with *implicit Faith*. I preſume, Sr, you have not the Vanity to pretend to *know*, much leſs to *underſtand* the *whole Bible*. Yet I have the Charity to think you believe both all the Facts and doctrinal Truths whether intelligible or unintelligible contain'd in it. Nay you muſt either do it, or renounce all reveal'd Religion. And what is this but Believing with *implicit Faith*? But ſuppoſe any one ſhould have the Vanity to think he knows and underſtands the whole Bible, yet it is certain there are Thouſands amongſt Chriſtians, who do not; and are not theſe bound to believe what they neither know, nor underſtand of it with an *implicit Faith*? When St *Peter* ſaid to our Saviour, *John 6. ℣. 68. Thou haſt the Words of eternal Life*: had he not an *implicit Faith* of all the Myſteries of Chriſtian Religion? And is this a Thing to be ridiculed?

You ſay, at this Rate we need but one Article of our *Creed*, viz. *to believe the holy Catholick Church*. But I deny your Conſequence. Becauſe there are ſeveral Articles, all are bound to believe with an *explicit Faith*. As, the *Being of a God*, the *Divinity of Chriſt*, *&c.* and therefore early Care is taken to teach Children their *Creed*, and explain to them all the Articles it contains. But let us hear, what you have ſtill more to ſay againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*.

§. 32.

No Danger of Idolatry from the Adoration of Christ in the Eucharist.

» *G.* BUt there is ſomething yet more terrible be-
» hind. For, if there be no *Tranſubſtantia-*
» *tion*, then you worſhip *Bread* and *Wine* with *Latria*,
» by which you mean the *ſupreme Worſhip* due to *God*
» alone. *pag.* 155.

L. How Scrupulous are Men ſometimes even a-gainſt their Conſcience! But pray Sr, would you be ſo very much frighten'd, if an *Arian* ſhould argue thus againſt the *Divinity* of Chriſt? *But there is ſome-thing yet more terrible behind: for if* Chriſt *be not God, you are all Idolaters.* Sr, we have no different Claſſes of *reveal'd Truths* as to their Certainty; all being e-qually grounded upon *God's Veracity*: and we are as certain of the *Revelation* of Chriſt's *real Preſence* in the *Euchariſt*, as of the *Divinity* of his Perſon.

» *G.* But, My Lord, tho *Tranſubſtantiation* were
» granted, and fully underſtood, yet it is impoſſi-
» ble for any Man to know whether he *worſhips* plain
» *Bread* and *Wine*, or the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*.
» Becauſe in the *Rubrick* of the *Maſs*, *de defectibus*
» *circa Miſſam*, there are ſeveral Caſes put, wherein
» the *Conſecration* is void, and there is no *Sacrament*
» made, and then there is nothing there but plain
» *Bread* and *Wine*. One of theſe Caſes is, if there be a
» greater Mixture of any other Grain than of *Wheat*
» in the *Wafer*. Another is, if the *Wine* be made of
» ſour Grapes or Grapes not ripe; *ſi vinum ſit ex*
» *uvis acerbis vel non maturis*; which is pretty hard
» to know for the People, who never taſt it, or the
» *Worſhippers* who ſee or taſt neither but only a

Pixis, or a *Cup* they look not into: and in both these Cases besides others it is said, *non conficitur Sacramentum*, there is no *Sacrament* made. And so it is said, if the *Intention* of the *Priest* be Wanting, which is impossible to know. Upon which Head they put a pleasant Case; As suppose a Priest *intends* to consecrate *ten Wafers* (for Example) and after Consecration there be found *eleven* or *more*; then none of them are consecrated, because the *Intention* going only to *ten*, it cannot be known, which these *ten* are. But if there be *Nine* or fewer, they are all consecrated, because the *Intention* going to *ten*, it includes all within that Number. Besides you take it wholly upon Trust, whether there be any *Consecration* at all; because your *Priests* do not *consecrate* before the People, when they administer the *Sacrament*, but at set Times they *consecrate* Numbers of *Wafers* together, which they reserve for Occasions, and for daily *Worship*. Again it is said in some Cases, *dubium est an conficiatur Sacramentum*. That it is doubtful whether the *Sacrament* be made or not. And what shall we do in this Case? Is it a *Doubt* whether we worship *God* or a *Creature*? Or is it *indifferent* to which we give *Latria*? pag. 155. 156.

L. Sr, many of your Observations are wholly frivolous; but the Sum of all is this, *viz.* that an *unconsecrated Host* may possibly be mistaken for a *consecrated one*; which is easily granted. And you conclude from it, that they, who *adore Christ* supposing him by Mistake present under that *Host*, are guilty of *Idolatry*, which I deny. For how is it possible a Person intending Nothing else but to *adore Christ*, should commit *Idolatry* whether he will or no? *Idolatry* is a most grievous *Sin*, and every Sin is an *Act* of the *Will* freely consenting to it. Because, tho a

Man may ſometimes commit a Sin even againſt his Inclination out of Compliance, or for Lucre, 'tis a meer *Chimera* to ſin againſt one's Will. And how then can he commit the Sin of *Idolatry*, when his Heart and Will are wholly intent upon *Adoring Chriſt*, whom he ſuppoſes to be *really preſent?*

„ We read *John.* 12. ℣. 21. that ſeveral *Gentiles* came with a Deſire to ſee *Chriſt*. Now let us ſuppoſe, that for want of a Guide to direct them, they had proſtrated themſelves at the Feet of ſome other, would any reaſonable Man have condemn'd them as guilty of *Idolatry?* Or ſuppoſe St *Mary Magdalene*, as she took *Chriſt* to be the *Gardiner*, Joh. 2. ℣. 15. Had with as much Innocence afterwards taken the *Gardiner* for *Chriſt*, would this have made her an *Idolater?* I preſume your exceſſive zeal would have paſs'd Sentence of Condemnation upon her. But I can never imagine, that a true and ardent Love of *Jeſus-Chriſt* can be the Sin of *Idolatry*.

„ But let us hear, how an eminent *Proteſtant* Writer anſwers this frivolous Objection. I mean Dr *Taylor*: who in his *Liberty of Prophecying*, Sect. 2. Numb. 26. writes thus. *Idolatry* (ſays he) *is forſaking the true God, and giving Divine Worship to a Creature, or to an Idol, that is, to an imaginary God. Now it is evident, that the Object of their* [i. e. the *Papiſts*] *Adoration in the bleſſed Sacrament, is the only true and eternal God, Hypoſtatically join'd with his Humanity*; which *Humanity they believe actually preſent under the Veil of the ſacramental Signs. And, if they thought him not preſent, they are ſo far from Worshipping the Bread in this Caſe, that themſelves profeſs it Idolatry to do ſo. Which is a* Demonstration, *that their Soul has nothing in it but what is a great Enemy to Idolatry: and nothing burns in Hell, but proper Will.* Thus Doctor *Taylor*; who writes like a fair Adverſary, and a Man of Senſe.

At

As to the two ſmart Queſtions, wherewith you conclude, viz. *Is it a Doubt whether we worship God or a Creature? Or is it indifferent, to which we give Latria?* I anſwer it is not. Becauſe our *Adoration* is directed wholly and ſolely to *Jeſus-Chriſt*: who I preſume is neither a *pure Creature*, nor an *Idol*.

G. But do you not *adore* the *Hoſt*? And if it be an *unconſecrated* one, do you not then *adore* a *Creature*?

L. Sr, the *Hoſt* implies two Things. *Firſt*, the *Sacramental Signs*, and *2dly*, the *true Body and Blood of Chriſt*. And therefore, when we are ſaid to *adore* the *Hoſt*, the Meaning is, that we adore *Jeſus-Chriſt* under the *Veil* of the *Sacramental Signs*. But our *Adoration* is not directed to the *Accidents* themſelves any more, than the Adoration of *Chriſt cloath'd* upon Earth was directed to his *Cloaths*. And ſo there is no Danger of *Idolatry*, tho the *Hoſt*, which the People preſent ſuppoſe *conſecrated*, ſhould by Miſtake or Malice be an *unconſecrated* one. Becauſe their Act of *Worship* being directed to *Chriſt alone* ſuppoſed to be corporally preſent and not to *Bread*, their Miſtake regards the *Place* alone, and not the *Object*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

His *Lordship* in the *Gentleman's Caſe ſtated* having ſome Difficulty to get rid of the foregoing Objection, anſwers (according to his uſual Method of Miſtaking Things) that in the Suppoſition of an unconſecrated Hoſt, they who adore it are guilty only of *Material*, but not of *formal* Idolatry. To which the *Gentleman* replies in the following Manner.

§. 33.

Of School-distinctions.

THese *School-distinctions* are meer *Cobwebs*, and will bear no weight. For *Material Idolatry* is *Idolatry*, else it were not *Material Idolatry*. And if our *Intention* will solve it, it will solve it also as to the *Heathens*, who directed their *Worship*, and referr'd it ultimately to the *true God*, as has been shewn.

But I hope you will not make *Salomon* so stupid, as you have made the *Heathen*, and to think that he believed *Ashtoreth* the Goddess of the *Sidonians*, and *Milchom* the Abomination of the *Ammonites*, and the other Gods of the Nations whom he worshipped, to be every one of them the one only *supreme God*. Yet he is charged with *Idolatry*, whether *Material* or *formal* is not the Question; not is there a Word of it in the *Scriptures*; for *Idolatry* is *Idolatry*, let it be of What sort it will; and these Distinctions are only to excuse it, and let it loose among us.

The *Arians* were charged with *Idolatry* for Worshipping *Christ* supposing him but a *Creature*: and they were so far from Disowning the true *God*, that it was his Honour they pretended in Denying the *Divinity* of *Christ*. So of the *Socinians*, and our *Unitarians* among us, who give themselves that Name for Supporting the *Unity* of the *Godhead*. Yet they are charged with Idolatry for Worshipping *Christ* as an *inferiour God*. And they have the same Distinction as you of *Latria* and *Dulia*, a higher and lower Degree of Worship. But all *Religious* Worship is forbidden to any but to *God*

alone. These *Degrees* of it are of human Invention « to excuse your Breach of the Commands of God. « But we are to keep far from the forbidden Thing, « not try how near we can come to it by *Distinctions* « of our own Coyning. We ought to *make a Hedge* « *about the Law*, as the Phrase of the *Jews* was to « guard against any Approaches towards the Breach « of it. Or in the Apostle's Words, *to abstain from* « *all Appearance of Evil*. And remember, that you « venture your Soul upon these *Distinctions*. Which « then are in the safest Way, we who follow the « Dirett *Rule of God's Commandements*, as they are « plainly laid down to us in holy *Scripture* without « *turning to the right Hand or to the left, without either* « *Adding to them, or Diminishing from them as we are* « *commanded* Deut. 4. ℣. 32. Or you who *distinguish* « the plainest *Precepts*, and make them speak *Meta-* « *physicks?* «

By which the Worship of the *Devil* may be « justified: for it is plain, that when he offer'd to « our *Saviour* all the *Kingdoms* of the *World*, he meant « not that he was the *Supreme God* and *Sovereign* « *Disposer*. For he said, *that is deliver'd unto me, and* « *to whomsoever I will I give it*, Luke 4. ℣. 6. 8. And « it is as plain by the Answer our Saviour gave him, « *thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him alone thou* « *shalt serve*, that all Sort of *Religious Worship* was for- « bidden to be given to any but to *God* alone. And St « *Austin* makes all to be *Devils* who *require* and *accept* « it. *Latria* and *Dulia* signify both the same Thing, « that is, *Service*; and here all *Religious Service* is re- « served to *God* alone. The *Distinction* of the *Schools* is « vain, and meant only to elude the Commands of « *God*, and introduce all *Superstition*. pag. 156. 157. 158. «

L. Sr, since you are so very sharp upon *School-* « *distinctions*, I shall consider presently, whether you

be not many Times obliged to have recourſe to them as well as we. But in the Caſe we have now before us, to wit, of an *unconſecrated Hoſt*, the Diſtinction between *formal* and *material Idolatry* is wholly unneceſſary. For I deny poſitively, that in that Caſe a Perſon adoring *Chriſt* (whom he ſuppoſes *really preſent* under the *ſacramental Veils*) commits even *material Idolatry*. Becauſe the *direct Object* of his Adoration is not *Bread* or the *Accidents* of it, but *Jeſus-Chriſt* alone; who being neither a *pure Creature*, nor a *falſe God*, his Adoration of him is no Idolatry at all either *material* or *formal*, but an Act of divine Worſhip. Pray remember what Dr *Tailor* has already told us upon this Subject.

However, tho the Diſtinction of *formal* and *material* be unneceſſary, as I have now fully ſhew'd, in the Caſe under Debate, what wretched Stuff do you entertain me with, when you tell me, *that material Idolatry is Idolatry, elſe it were not material Idolatry.* Which is juſt as wiſely ſaid, as if a young *Logician* ſhould argue thus, *a dead Man is a Man, elſe he were not a dead Man.* And you add, *if our intention will ſolve it* (that is, excuſe it from being *Idolatry*) *it will alſo ſolve it as to the Heathens, who directed their Worſhip, and referr'd it ultimately to the true God.* Which is flatly falſe, tho you confidently add, *as you have ſhew'd*: whereas you ſhould only ſay, *as you have endeavour'd and labour'd hard to ſhew to your immortal Honour.* For you may as eaſily prove the *Devil* to be a *Beauty*, as that the *Heathens* directed their Worſhip, and referr'd it ultimately to the *true God.*

Your Inſtance concerning *Salomon* is the wideſt imaginable from the Purpoſe. For tho he neither believed *Aſhtoreth*, nor *Milchom*, nor the other *Heathen Idols*, whom he worſhipped, to be *true Gods*, yet he was certainly guilty not of *material*, but true

and *formal Idolatry*; because his direct Intention (tho out of Compliance to his Mistresses) was to offer *divine Honour* to their *Idols*; And his Crime was precisely this, that knowing them to be the *Statues* of *Devils* or *evil Spirits* he paid them the *supreme Worship*, which is due to God alone.

As to the *Arians*, *Socinians*, and *Unitarians* mention'd by you; they may likewise be justly charged with *Idolatry*, if believing *Christ* to be no more than a *pure Creature*, they worship him as *God*; which I never heard they did; But you say, *they cover all with the Distinction of Latria and Dulia*: then I am sure they do not worship him as *God*, as I shall prove immediately, by explaining the Meaning of that Distinction.

But let us now see, whether you can stand your Ground against *Socinians*, *Anabaptists* and *Jews* without the Help of *School-distinctions*, which you declaim so bitterly against. Suppose a *Socinian* should prove his Blasphemy against the *Divinity* of *Christ* from these Words of *St. John* 14. v. 28. *My Father is greater than I.* How would you answer him?

G. Very easily, My Lord: for I would tell him those Words are to be understood not with Relation to the *Divine*, but *human Nature* of *Christ*.

L. Very right Sir. But it seems then that School-distinctions are not always mere *Cobwebs*, or *vain Things that will break no Weight*, but they are sometimes both useful and necessary to support Religion. And pray remember (as you just now exhorted me) that you venture the very Foundation of *Christian Religion*, and your own Soul into the Bargain upon your *Distinction* of the foremention'd plain Words of Christ. For if the Distinction be vain, you are guilty of *real Idolatry* in Worshipping *Christ* as God. But if Distinctions be *good* and *legal* in a *Protestant's*

Mouth against *Socinians*, I may modestly say they are equally *good* and *legal* in a *Papist's* Mouth against *Protestants*.

G. But, My Lord, do we *distinguish* the *Commandements?*

L. Sr., to answer this, I have a second Question ready for *you*. Is not this Precept, *thou shalt not kill*, one of the ten *Commandements?*

G. What then?

L. Why then Sr, all those are guilty of a Breach of this *Commandement*, who *kill* their Enemies in War. For the *Commandement* is *general* and *absolute:* and there is no *Distinction*, or *Limitation* tack'd to it.

G. But, My Lord, all the World understands it of *Killing* by *private Authority*.

L. Then all the World must condemn the malicious Nonsense you have talk'd, and own, that the *plainest Commandement* may be *distinguish'd*, and made *to speak Metaphysicks*, as you call it.

But I have a third Question to ask. Is not *Saturday*, or the 7th Day of the Week meant by the *Sabbath-day* in holy Writ?

G. Yes, My Lord. For God himself says *Deut.* 5. *v.* 13. 14. *Six Days shalt thou labour, and do all thy Work, but the seventh Day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.* And therefore *Saturday* is call'd in *Latin*, *dies Sabati*, as it is still the Day of *Worship* amongst the *Jews*.

L. Well, and is not this Precept, *thou shalt keep holy the Sabbath-day*, among the *Commandements* of the *Decalogue?* Is it not clear and precise as to the very Day of the Week?

G. Who doubts it?

L. And why then do you keep the *Sunday* instead of *Saturday holy?*

G. My Lord, the *particular Day*, which we call *Saturday*, was only commanded with Relation to the *Jews*, but not to *Christians*, who have therefore changed the *Saturday* into the *Sunday*.

L. What! Still another *Distinction* even of the very *plaineſt Precept*, and that without the leaſt Foundation in the Word of God! Did you not juſt now tell me, that *ſuch Diſtinctions are meer human Inventions to excuſe our Breach of the Commands of God?* That *we are to keep far from the forbidden Thing, not try how near we can come to it by Diſtinctions?* That finally we *ought to make a Hedge about the Law, or in the Apoſtles Words to abſtain from all Appearance of Evil?* Thus you preach'd to me juſt now with a great Deal of zeal. But pray Sr, what becomes now of all this fine *Cant?* For either the *Commandements* may be *diſtinguiſh'd*, or not. If not, how can you defend yourſelf either againſt *Anabaptiſts* Denying the Lawfulneſs of ſhedding Blood according to the fifth Commandement, or againſt the *Jews* inſiſting upon the expreſs Commandement of *keeping the Sabbath*, that is, the *Saturday*, *Holy?* But if they may, is not all you have ſaid againſt our *diſtinguishing* the *Commandements* meer Pedantick Cavelling, and Nonſenſe?

Suppoſe a *Jew* should retort upon you, what you juſt now ſaid to me, viz. *Which then are in the ſafeſt Way, we who follow the direct Rule of God's Commandements as they are plainly laid down to us in holy Scripture without Turning to the Right Hand or to the Left, or you who diſtinguish the plaineſt Precepts, and make them ſpeak Metaphyſiks?* Suppoſe, I ſay, a *Jew* should retort this Canting Stuff upon you, you muſt either turn *Jew*, or make him an Anſwer, which will be a Cap to fit your own Block. Unleſs you have this pretty *Salvo* to come off with, *viz.* that a *Popiſh Diſtinction*

of the Commandements *is meant only to elude them, and introduce all Superstition*, but that *Protestants* may *distinguish* them without any such Felonious Intention: And then we shall have a supernumerary *Metaphysical Distinction*, which the *Schoolmen* yet never thought of.

However I perceive the *Popish Distinction* of *Latria* and *Dulia* will by no Means go down with you. But pray Sr, what do you call the *Honour* you pay to *Saints* and *Angels*, when you keep *Holy-Days* in Memory of them? For I am apt to think, this *Distinction*, as *Popish* as it is, will be here full as serviceable to you against the *Dissenters*, as it is to us against the *Church of England*. For, give it what Name you please, if *keeping Holy-days* be any Part of *Christian Devotion*, all the World besides yourselves will call it a *Religious Honour*: Because when we *honour* Persons meerly for *Supernatural Gifts* bestow'd upon them by *God*, then the *Honour* we pay them is in the common Language of Mankind call'd *Religious*. And, if the *English* Word, *Worship*, be extendable, as it certainly is, to all Sorts of *Religious Honour*, then it follows, that besides the *supreme Religious Worship* call'd *Latria*, which is due to *God alone*, there is likewise an *Inferiour Religious Worship* call'd *Dulia*, paid to God's *Saints* and *Angels* even by your *Church*. Which plainly shews, how wretchedly you are out in Saying that *Latria* and *Dulia signify both the same Thing*: And the Consequence of all is, that you are no less out in your main Assertion, viz. *That all Sort of Religious Worship is forbid to be given to any but to God alone*. Unless you will acknowledge, that your own *Church* is as guilty of Acting contrary to that Pretended Prohibition, as *Papists* themselves. Nay 'tis impossible for you to answer the *Dissenters* but with the Help of that very *Popish Distinction*, or some-

thing

thing equivalent to it, which you have taken ſo much Pains to ridicule.

As to your Saying, that St *Auſtin* makes all to be *Devils, who require or accept of any Religious Honour*, I am only ſorry you put me again in Mind of your Sins paſt: I mean your *Controverſial Sin* of *Falſifying*: which in a Diſpute about *Religion* may be counted amongſt the *Deadly* ones; and ought therefore to be repented of and retracted, rather than aggravated by an inſulting Repetition.

But the fineſt Stroke is yet to come; *viz.* your Saying, that by the Diſtinction of *Supreme* and *Inferiour Worſhip*, which we call *Latria* and *Dulia*; *the Worſhip of the Devil may be Juſtify'd*. What Sr! are you in good Earneſt, when you talk ſuch extravagant Stuff! May the *Devil* be *worſhipped* with an *Inferiour* or *Relative Honour* as well as the *Friends* and *Servants* of *God*! This I preſume is a Piece of *Divinity*, in which you have not yet many Followers. However, as you have already *one Holyday* for all the *Saints* in genetal, and *another* for St *Michael* and all the *Angels*; who knows, but that by your Intereſt and Zeal the *Reformation* of the *Church of England* may be ſo well improved in Time, that a *Day* may likewiſe be ſet apart for *Lucifer* and his *Angels*? For ſince *the one* may be *juſtify'd* by *the other*, why ſhould not the *Devil* have his Due? I am ſure the *Religious Honour* you pay to *Saints* and *Angels* in keeping their *Holydays* is *juſtify'd* by the Practice of *both Churches*: and if that will *juſtify* our Giving the ſame *Religious Honour* to the *Devil*, I ſee no Reaſon why according to this new Syſtem of *Proteſtant Divinity* he ſhould not have a *Holyday* allow'd him.

The *Papiſts* indeed will be highly Scandaliz'd and cry out Shame againſt it; becauſe they make a large Difference between the *faithful Friends* and *Servants*

of *God* and his *incorrigible mortal Enemy* the *Devil*. They diſcover in the former the beautiful Supernatural Gifts of *Grace* and *Glory*, which entitle them to an *inferiour Religious Honour* for the Sake of him who has beſtow'd thoſe Gifts upon them, and to whom that *Honour* is *ultimately* referr'd: But they ſee Nothing in the *Devil*, which can juſtify their honouring him in the ſame Manner.

'Tis true, the *Devil* was ſo true to himſelf (as you have carefully remark'd to do him *Juſtice*) as not to pretend to be the *Supreme God* and *Sovereign Diſpoſer* of all Things. But do's it follow from thence, that he may be put upon the *Level* with *God's* moſt *faithful Servants*, and be *honour'd* by us as they are? For Shame Sr, ſee your Error, and be Senſible to what Extravagances the *Prejudice* of *Education* will hurry a Man, that gives himſelf blindly up to it.

§. 34.

Some Touches of the Gentleman's *Skill in* Drollery, *and* Slander.

» *G.* MY Lord, beſides the Caſes already men-
» tion'd by me, there are ſome unworthy
» ones put in the *Rubrick* of the *Maſs*; as if a *Dog*
» or a *Mouſe* should eat the *Sacrament* --- if a *Prieſt*
» should vomit it up again, in which Caſe he is to
» lick it up *Reverently*, unleſs it be *nauſeous* (that
» was well put in) and then it is to be diſpoſed of ſo
» and ſo. And again if a *Fly* should drop into the
» *Cup*, how the *fly* is to be dealt with. --- And one
» Reaſon given for taking the *Cup* from the *Laity*
» was, that the *Laity* (at that Time I ſuppoſe) wore
» long *Beards*, and leaſt the *Blood* of *Chriſt* should
» drop upon them or ſtick to their *Whiskers*. All

theſe are the genuine Effects of *Superſtition*, occa- «
ſion'd by the Notion of *Tranſubſtantiation*. p. 139. «

L. Sr, all *Religion* is *Superſtition* to thoſe, who have little of it beſides the empty Name and Show. However this pleaſant Drollery is at leaſt a Teſtimony, that we are convinced in our *Hearts* of what we profeſs with our *Tongues*: Since it appears from it, how extremely ſolicitous we are both to *prevent* Indecencies in the *Adminiſtration* of the *Sacrament*, and *remedy* them the beſt Way poſſible, when they chance to happen.

But let that be as it will, I ſhall put a Caſe ſomewhat like one of the *unworthy* ones you have mention'd. Your *Church-Catechiſm* teaches, that *in the Lord's Supper the faithful receive Verily and indeed the Body and Blood of Chriſt*. Now ſuppoſe a ſudden Fit of *Vomiting* ſhould take a *Faithful Proteſtant* in the very Moment he receives the *Sacrament*, I ask whether he may not in that Caſe *vomit up Verily and indeed*, what he has juſt then *received Verily and indeed*? And if this ſhould happen, I deſire to know what is to be done? If you can propoſe any Thing more Decent than what is preſcribed in the *Rubrick* of the *Maſs*, I am very confident your Advice will not be neglected, unleſs you be for the *licking Part*, of which there is not a Word in the *Rubrick*, you refer me to. But this dirty Fiction was neceſſary to furniſh ſome Matter for a *Jeſt*.

However I muſt here deſire you to take Notice, that for one *Scurrilous Jeſt* a *Proteſtant* can make upon *Tranſubſtantiation*, a *Deiſt* or *Atheiſt* diſpoſed to ſhew his Wit that Way ſhall make a thouſand upon the *Incarnation* and *Death* of the *Son of God*: And, if *Lampooning* be good *Arguing*, we may ſoon be laugh'd out of the very *Fundamentals* of *Chriſtianity*.

» G. But here, My Lord, I muſt beg Leave to » obſerve, that the natural Effect of *Superſtition* is » *Atheiſm* and *Deiſm*; as one Extreme runs into an- » other like *Eaſt* to *Weſt*. For Men of Senſe muſt » find out the Deceit that is in *Superſtition*: and then » Placing all *Religion* on the ſame Foot (as in your » Communion upon the Authority of your *Church*) » they muſt think the whole to be a *Deceit*, or in » the Modish Word *Prieſt-Craft*, and the Contri- » vance of thoſe who gain by it. Whence it is that » the Holy *Scriptures* and the *Legends* have the ſame » Foundation in the Church of *Rome*, that is, her » *Authority*: Therefore the common People believe » them both alike, and the Men of Senſe believe » neither. And this does ſo lead towards the General » *Defection* foretold, that in a great Meaſure it is it. » For it deſtroys the Foundation of *Religion*, and » turns it all to *Superſtition*. And when the *Infidelity*, » which that begets, ſhall come to be publickly » own'd, then where ſhall *Faith* be found upon » Earth? It is now *acted* in the *opus operatum*: and » inſtead of the *two Sacraments* which *Chriſt* has ap- » pointed as *Means of Grace*, the whole Face of your » *Religion* is cover'd with ten thouſand of your own » Invention. The unlimited Power taken in your » *Church* of *Conſecrating* every Thing into a *Means* » *of Grace*, your Worship of *Saints* (many of them » *Legendary*) their *Reliques* and *Images*, of *Croſſes* and » of the *Hoſt* make up the Bulk of your *Religion*, » and *Devotions*. pag. 159. 160.

L. And, Sr, the *Bulk* of this Diſcourſe of yours is made up of Slander, and the old thread-bare Non- ſenſe of *opus operatum*, *Means of Grace*, *Sacraments of our own Invention*, *&c.* already-repeated twenty Times, and as often confuted. [Vide §. 1. 3. 4. 2d Part.] Fine Stuff indeed for a Man of Senſe!

You ſay, *Faith* is now *acted* in the *opus operatum*. And is not this a pretty Handle for *Atheiſts* to lay hold of to ridicule the *Sacraments*? Will they not ſay, that in the Adminiſtration of *Baptiſm* (which I defy you or any Man to explain without the Doctrine of *opus operatum*) *Faith* is only *acted* by *Prieſts* and *Parſons* as ſo many *Mountebanks* upon a Stage? I know you are not much concern'd for the *five Sacraments*, we acknowledge more than you, and which by a true *Proteſtant Figure*, call'd *Slander*, you have multiply'd into *ten Thouſand*. But if *Faith* be only *Acted* in the Uſe of theſe *Sacraments* and the cuſtomary *Benedictions* of the *Church* (of which you alſo have your Share, as I have ſhew'd §. 3.) if *Faith* I ſay be only *acted* in theſe, will not *Atheiſts* and *Deiſts* have a fair Handle to reproach us, that we are likewiſe no better than *Stage-players* in the Adminiſtration of the *two Sacraments* acknowledg'd by you, and other *publick Devotions* of the *Church*? Will they not have Reaſon to regard all Religion as *Prieſtcraft*, which you ſay is now the *modiſh Word*? But pray, Sr, who brought that ſcandalous Expreſſion chiefly into Vogue? It was a Member of the *Church of England*, who had ſo mean an Opinion of the Religion he was then of, and particularly of the Miniſters of it, that he ſcarce ever repreſented them in his Writings but under the moſt vile and contemptible Characters. But when he became a *Roman Catholick*, for which he loſt his Penſion of Poet laureate in King *Wiliam's* Reign, he uſed no ſuch prophane Language. Nay he employ'd his Pen in Defence of the Religion he had embraced, and particularly of the *Myſtery*, you impugn with ſo much Bitterneſs. Which ſhews, that tho he were acknowledg'd by all to be a Man of excellent Senſe, he could ſee nothing of the *Superſtition* you lay to our Charge; nor

find out the *Deceit* or *Prieſtcraft* you ſpeak of, but in the Religion he had abandon'd: And he was ſo far from becoming an *Atheiſt* or *Deiſt* by the Change, that it purged him effectually of the *Atheiſtical* Principles he had imbibed, and uſed to maintain and glory in, whilſt he was a Member of your Church.

This leads me to a direct Anſwer to the firſt Part of what you ſpoke laſt; where you obſerve, that the natural Effect of *Superſtition* is *Atheiſm* and *Deiſm*: and out of the Abundance of your Charity for us, you confidently ſuppoſe us to be deeply concern'd in that *Superſtition*, whereof *Atheiſm* and *Deiſm* is, as you tell us, the natural Effect.

Here then to make your Obſervation fully anſwer the Charitable End you drive at, you ought to ſhew, that profeſs'd *Atheiſts* and *Deiſts* were far more numerous in this Nation *before*, that they have been *ſince* the *Reformation*. For, if what you commonly call *Popiſh Superſtition* (which is precifely the *pretended Superſtition* you ſpeak of) has a natural Tendency to *Atheiſm* and *Deiſm*, the undeniable Conſequence muſt be, that During the many hundred Years, wherein that *Superſtition* was univerſally profeſs'd and practiſed in this Nation, when it had the *Law* on it's Side, and the Authority of all the *Tribunals* both *Civil* and *Eccleſiaſtick* to ſupport it, the Conſequence I ſay muſt be, that in thoſe Days of *Popery Atheiſts* and *Deiſts* muſt like *Egyptian Locuſts* have overſpread the whole Land; whereas it is a noted Fact, that thoſe wild Beaſts never appear'd in *Heards*, or *bare-faced* to deſtroy the *Vineyard*, till the Fences of the *Church* were laid open, and her Authority made *precarious* by the bleſſed *Reformation*.

Pray, Sr, if the natural Effect of what you call *Popiſh Superſtition* be *Atheiſm* or *Deiſm*, will it not follow, that *this Effect* muſt appear very remarkably in

thoſe of our *Communion*? Shew me then the *profeſs'd Atheiſts* or *Deiſts* amongſt *Roman Catholicks*. Shew me from ſome Hiſtory, that there was a *Sect* of *Deiſts* or *Free-thinkers* in *Great-Britain* before it's *Religion* was *reform'd*; And then your Obſervation will be allow'd to have at leaſt ſome Senſe in it. But if you can ſhew no ſuch Thing; If on the Contrary it be as well known as any Piece of publick News that all the noted *Atheiſts*, *Deiſts*, or *Free-thinkers* in *Great-Britain* were either brought up in the *Proteſtant Communion*, or turn'd *Proteſtants* to be at full Liberty to turn afterwards what they pleaſed; if it be a certain Truth, that the *two Sects* of *Deiſts* and *Free-thinkers* are of a much later Date than the *Reformation*, and had their *grand Leſſon* of *private Judgment* in Oppoſition to *Church-Authority* taught them in *Proteſtant Schools*; then give me leave to tell you Sr, that the *Men of Senſe*, you appeal to, will be ſo far from Judging the *Religion* you traduce to be the Source of *Atheiſm* or *Deiſm*, that they will certainly Judge your Obſervation to be as void of Juſtice, as it is of common Senſe.

And what then will they think of the Scandalous Piece that follows? viz. *That the holy Scriptures and the Legends have the ſame Foundation in the Church of Rome, that is, her Authority.* And that *therefore the common People believe them both alike, and our Men of Senſe believe neither.* This certainly is a Calumny of ſo black a Nature, that *Proteſtants* themſelves cannot but be highly ſcandalized at it. For as to our common People, there is not a Child amongſt us that knows his Catechiſm, but is a living Witneſs againſt you, and will tell you he has been taught, that the *Scriptures* were writ by *Divine Inſpiration*, and have *Divine Authority* for the Truth of every Thing they contain: But that their Belief of the *Legends*

like that of any *prophane History* is grounded meerly upon *human Authority*; and they are free to *believe* or *disbelieve* them according as their own private Judgment shall direct them. But as to what you add, *that our Men of Sense neither believe Scriptures nor Legends*, I am very confident there is not a Man of Sense or Probity in your own *Church*, but will blush for you, and disclaim any Part in this gross Calumny. So I leave you to account for it at the great Tribunal. I shall say nothing to the Consequence you draw from it relating to the pretended *general Defection*. For Consequences grounded upon barefaced Calumny are sufficiently answer'd by Exposing the Calumny itself.

§. 35.

Transubstantiation *as ancient as* Christianity.

NOw Sr, to conclude the Subject we have been so long upon, I shall propose an Argument, which appears to me to be a moral Demonstration, that the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation* is as *ancient* as *Christianity*, and never had a Beginning but from the *Apostles* themselves. I shall explain myself in the cleareſt Manner I am able; and the first Thing I remark to you is, that if the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation* be a *Novelty*, it is one of the most extraordinary Nature, that ever was broach'd: Both because it is not a meer *Speculative* Doctrine, but the Ground of the most solemn *practical Devotions* of the *Church*; and because it is in itself the most seemingly repugnant to all the *Senses* and *Reason* of Mankind.

G. And what do's your Lordship infer from thence?

L. Sr, I infer from it, *first*, that a *Novelty* of this Nature

Nature could not be brought into the *Church* without *Noiſe*, *Diſputes*, and *Troubles*; and in a Word, without the greateſt *Difficulty* and *Oppoſition* imaginable: becauſe People are not wont to part *tamely* and *quietly* with their *ancient Faith*; eſpecially when a Doctrine the moſt repugnant in Appearance to *Senſe* and *Reaſon* is ſubſtituted in Place of it. I infer *2dly*, that the exact *Time*, *Manner*, and other *Circumſtances* of a *Novelty* of that importance being brought in, and made an *Article* of *Faith* muſt of Neceſſity be known by all the learned Part of the World. Whence I infer *3dly*, that the *Hiſtories* of the Time, in which this happen'd, muſt all be fill'd with particular Relations of the moſt *memorable Events* occaſion'd by this wonderful *Change* in the *publick Faith* of the *Church*.

Now I have already proved with the utmoſt Evidence againſt Dr *Coſin*, that the *Doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation* was held both by the *Greek* and *Latin Church* in the *Eleventh* Century, when it was firſt openly writ againſt by *Berengarius*, who was immediately oppoſed by the ableſt Pens of that Time, and condemn'd by eleven *Provincial Councils* in that very Age; the laſt whereof defined in expreſs Terms, *that the Bread and Wine, when they are conſecrated upon the Altar, are truly and eſſentially changed into the Body and Blood of our Saviour, and not in Figure only.* Tom. 10. Conc. Lab. pag. 502.

If then the *Doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation* be not as *ancient* as the *Apoſtles* themſelves, but a *Novelty* invented ſince their Time, it muſt have been introduced into the *Church* in ſome Age between the *Death* of the *Apoſtles*, and the *Eleventh Century*. And unleſs *Proteſtants* can prove this Fact from the unconteſtable Evidence of as Authentick *Hiſtories* and *Records*, as there are (for Example) to prove that *England* was

converted in ſome Age between the *Death* of the *Apoſtles* and the *Eleventh Century*, they labour in vain to perſuade any Man of Senſe that the *Doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation* is a *Novelty* invented ſince the Time of the *Apoſtles*.

The Reaſon hereof is manifeſt, becauſe all *Changes* in *Religion* are conſtantly attended with ſuch a Train of remarkable *Circumſtances* and *Events*, as cannot poſſibly eſcape the Notice of Hiſtorians; and I can as eaſily believe the greateſt Contradiction in Nature, as that *ſuch Changes* can really happen without being mention'd in the general Hiſtories both of the *Times*, which gave Birth to 'em, and of the *Kingdoms*, which were the principal Theatres, on which they were tranſacted.

Thus we have the *Hiſtory* of the *Arian*, *Neſtorian*, *Eutychian*, and other leſs conſiderable *Hereſies* tranſmitted to us by innumerable Hands, which inform us not only of the *Names*, but of the very *Perſonal Qualities* of the chief Authors of them: of the very *Year* and *Place*, wherein they were firſt broach'd: Of the *Progreſs* they made, the *Oppoſition* they metwith, the *Diſturbances* they occaſion'd, the *Books* that were writ *for* and *againſt* them, the *Councils* that were call'd to condemn them, and other ſuch Particulars, from whence we cannot but form a fix'd Judgment, *firſt*, that the main Facts contain'd in theſe Hiſtories are no Fictions; and *2dly*, that the *Doctrines* ſo particulariz'd in every Circumſtance relating to them have all the Marks of being *Novelties* brought into the *Church* ſince the *Time* of the *Apoſtles*.

Now if this be ſo in Relation to all *Hereſies* or *new Doctrines*, that ever were broach'd in the *Church*: If none of them could ever eſcape either being *detected* by the Vigilancy of her Paſtors, or *recorded* in the Writings of thoſe, whoſe Buſineſs it is to in-

ſtruct Poſterity in the Tranſactions of paſt Ages: If this, I ſay, be ſo, then let any one Judge, whether it be poſſible, that *ſuch a Change* in the *publick Faith* of the *Church* as the introducing of *Tranſubſtantiation* muſt have made (if it were not *Apoſtolical Doctrine*) could be compaſs'd without the ſame Violent *Struggles*, *Diſturbances*, and *Oppoſition*! And then I ask, whether it be poſſible, that *ſuch conſiderable Events* could be paſs'd over in Silence by the Hiſtories of the Times, in which they happen'd? I take this to be as morally impoſſible, as that the *Changes* of *Religion* in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, or the *Revolution* under King *James* II. ſhould be wholly omitted by an Hiſtorian writing the Lives of thoſe two Perſons.

This then is the Subſtance of my Argument in Short. *Tranſubſtantiation* was the *publick Faith* and Doctrine of the *Church* in the *Eleventh Century*: Therefore, if it was not taught by the *Apoſtles* themſelves, it was introduced in *ſome Age* between the *Death* of the *Apoſtles*, and *that Century*. But a *Novelty* of that extraordinary Nature, and ſo *repugnant* in Appearance to all the *Senſes* and *Reaſon* of Mankind could not be introduced without Noiſe, Diſputes, and Troubles, and throwing the whole Church into Diſorder and Confuſion; and ſuch remarkable Events cannot but be recorded in the Hiſtories of the Times, in which they happen'd; Therefore if nothing of this appears in any ancient or authentick Hiſtory, 'tis a moral Demonſtration, that they never happen'd at all: and that by Conſequence the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* is as ancient as Chriſtianity, and derived from the Apoſtles themſelves.

Let us ſuppoſe the whole Chriſtian World agree'd now in the Belief that the *Bread* and *Wine* remain unchanged in the *Sacrament*, and that this Be-

lief had been handed down to us from the very Time of the Apoſtles till now. I ask, *firſt*, whether it would be poſſible for any Man in this Caſe to introduce the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* without being oppoſed even by ſome whole National Churches, many Univerſities, and by numberleſs Perſons both of the prelatick Order and inferiour Clergy? I ask *2dly*, whether this Oppoſition would not cauſe great Diſturbances and Troubles, and throw the whole Church into the moſt violent Ferment? And I ask *3dly*, whether ſuch a Revolution in the publick Faith of the Church, in Caſe it ſhould ſucceed, could be paſs'd over in Silence by all the Writers of the Age, wherein it happen'd? I cannot think there is a rational Man upon Earth, but his Reaſon and Conſcience will tell him, they are all three morally impoſſible in the Caſe ſuppoſed. And indeed there is no Example of it ſince the very firſt Eſtabliſhment of Chriſtian Religion.

I add, that if *Tranſubſtantiation* be not *Apoſtolical* Doctrine, it is a moſt groſs and pernicious *Hereſy*: and ſince it is an unconteſtable Truth, that it was believed, profeſs'd, and maintain'd by the univerſal Church againſt *Berengarius* in the eleventh Century, if it be an *Hereſy*, it muſt have been invented in ſome *preceding Age*, by ſome *particular Hereſiarck*, in ſome *particular Town* or *Country*: and it muſt have had a *Name* to diſtinguiſh it both from other Hereſies, and the Orthodox Faith oppoſite to it.

Here then, to give a ſolid Anſwer to this Argument, you are bound to ſhew from ſome Authentick ancient Hiſtory all the following Particulars, viz. in *what age* between the *Death* of the *Apoſtles* and the *Eleventh Century* the *Doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation* was firſt invented. Who was the *firſt Author* of it. In what *Town* or *Country* it was firſt profeſs'd. (For

all *New Doctrines* muſt have their *Beginning* of *Place* as well as *Time*) By *what Name* the Profeſſors of it were diſtinguiſh'd from other *Hereticks*, and *what Councils* were call'd to condemn it. Becauſe there never was a *noted Hereſy* in the World, but was diſtinguiſh'd by *ſome Name*, and condemn'd in ſome *Council*, or by the *Church Diffuſive*. Finally, you muſt inform me by *what Methods* it made ſuch a prodigious Progreſs, as to be at length acknowledg'd, profeſs'd, and maintain'd by the *Univerſal Church*, as I have fully proved it was in the *Eleventh Century*.

Theſe are the moſt important Particulars, wherein I demand to be ſatisfy'd. For Nothing leſs can ſuffice to convince any Man of Senſe, that the *Doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation* is a *Novelty* invented ſince the Time of the *Apoſtles*. Neither muſt you pretend to ſlur me off with *precarious Gueſſes*, *bare Poſſibilities*, or *imaginary Suppoſitions* of your own fruitful Invention; but you muſt produce *Authentick Hiſtory* to atteſt the *Facts* I inſiſt upon, as all Men of Learning can do to witneſs every Fact of Moment relating to any *noted Hereſy*, that ever was in the World.

But, if neither you, nor any Body elſe can undertake this Task without expoſing himſelf to the Laughter of Mankind: If there be no *Ancient Hiſtory* Extant, in which there appears a fair Account both of the *Beginning*, the *Author*, *Time*, *Place*, and *Progreſs* of the *Doctrine* in Queſtion, with the moſt remarkable Events, that attended it till it's full *Eſtabliſhment* in the *Eleventh Century*, when it was the *publick Faith* both of the *Greek* and *Latin Church*: If, I ſay, nothing of all this can be found in any *Ancient Hiſtory* or *Records*, then I repeat once more, what I ſaid before, that ſuch a *univerſal Silence* relating to a Thing of that Moment is a mortal De-

monstration, that the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation* never had any other Beginning than from the *Apostles* themselves according to St *Austin's* Rule, which is grounded upon constant Experience and common Sense, viz. *that when any Doctrine is found generally received in the Visible Church in any Age whatsoever, whereof there is no certain Author or beginning to be found, then it is sure, that such a Doctrine came down from Christ, and his Apostles.* L. 4. de Bapt. C. 6. 24. as also Lib. de Unit. Eccl. C. 19.

Give me Leave, Sr, to illustrate all this from an Example, which will set the whole Matter in the clearest Light. I maintain, that the Doctrine opposite to *Transubstantiation* is an *Heresy*. If you ask me how I prove it to be one? I answer that I prove it from a full Collection of all such historical Facts as I demand of you to prove that *Transubstantiation* is a *Novelty* or *Heresy*. For I will shew the Doctrine opposite to it to be a *Novelty* brought into the Church many Ages after the Time of the *Apostles*. I will name the chief *Author* of it, the *Time* when, and the *Place* where he first broach'd it; the *Name* it was distinguish'd by, and finally the *Opposition* it met with in the universal Church.

It was first publickly maintain'd about the Middle of the eleventh Century at *Lions* in *France*. The chief Author of it was one *Berengarius* a Canon of that Place, and his Doctrine was call'd the *Berengarian Heresy*. He had few Followers in those Days, and himself retracted it before he died. Yet it alarm'd the whole Church, and caused very great Disturbances. The ablest Pens were employ'd against it, and it was condemn'd by eleven *Provincial* or *National Councils* before the End of that very Century. And all these Particulars with many more are transmitted to us by all the Ecclesiastical Histories of that Age.

This I think ſuffices to convince any Man of Senſe, that the Doctrine oppoſite to *Tranſubſtantiation* was regarded as an *Hereſy* by the Catholick Church in the eleventh Century, and it follows manifeſtly from it, that if *Tranſubſtantiation* itſelf had ever been regarded as an *Hereſy* by the Catholick Church in any of the preceding Ages, it muſt have undergone the ſame Fate, found the ſame Oppoſition, if not greater by Reaſon of it's ſeeming Extravagance, cauſed the ſame Diſturbances, excited the zeal of particular Perſons to write againſt it, and occaſion'd the Calling of Councils to condemn it. But ſince no ancient Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorian, or other Writer has ever Mention'd any ſuch Thing: Since neither the *Perſon* by whom, nor the *Place* where, nor the *Time* when it was firſt broach'd in any of thoſe Ages, nor finally any *Oppoſition* made to it by the Church in any Age between the Apoſtles and the eleventh Century was ever recorded in any Hiſtory, that ever appear'd in the World; I ſay once more that this is a moral Demonſtration, that the Catholick Church has never regarded *Tranſubſtantiation* as a *Novelty* or *Hereſy*, but as a Doctrine derived from *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles*. For it is wholly inconceivable, that the Doctrine oppoſite to *Tranſubſtantiation* should have been ſo vigorouſly oppoſed by the Church, if it were not a *Novelty*; and that *Tranſubſtantiation* itſelf, if it were a *Novelty*, should never meet with any Oppoſition at all. Now if you pleaſe, Sr, you may proceed to ſome other Subject.

§. 36.

Concerning the Worship *of the* Croſs, *and* Images *of* Chriſt.

» *G.* MY Lord, not only the *Hoſt*, or *Body of* » *Chriſt* ſuppoſed to be *corporally* in the *Sa-* » *crament*, but the *Croſs* of *Chriſt*, or any *Effigies* of » that *Croſs*, and the *Images* of *Chriſt* are worshipp'd » in your Church with the *ſupreme Divine Adoration* » of *Latria*. pag. 160.

L. Sr, that's falſe, and being extremely injurious, 'tis rank *Calumny*: For I defy you to prove from any *Catholick Divine*, that we worship the *Croſs* or *Images* of *Chriſt* with SUPREME DIVINE ADORATION.

» *G.* My Lord, it is taught by a great *Saint* of » your *Church*, whom you call the *Angelical Doctor*, » St *Thomas Aquinas*, who ſays [3. Par. Qu. 2. Art 4.] » that *Crux Criſti eſt adoranda Adoratione Latriæ*. And » again: *Crucis Effigies in aliqua alia Materia —— La-* » *triæ adoranda eſt*. And in the *Roman Pontifical* it is » order'd that in the Proceſſion of the *Emperor* and » a *Legate* of the *Pope*, the Legate's *Croſs* ſhall be » carried on the Right Hand of the Emperor's » *Sword*, becauſe *Latria* is due to the *Croſs*. pag. 161. » 162.

L. Sr, I ſtill inſiſt upon it, that you wrong us; becauſe the Words you have quoted, unleſs they be ſtrain'd from the known Senſe of the Author, do not amount to what you charge us with, *viz.* that we *worship* the *Croſs* or *Images* of *Chriſt* with SUPREME DIVINE ADORATION, as I ſhall fully prove, when you make an End of what you have to ſay upon that Subject.

G. My

G. My Lord, in the *Adoration* of the *Croſs* upon *Good-Friday* (which is the principal Part for the Office of that Day) the *Croſs* being veiled is diſcover'd to the People by Degrees; firſt one *Arm* of the *Croſs*, then another, and at laſt the whole *Croſs* is unveiled. And at each Time the Prieſt ſays *ecce lignum Crucis, behold the Wood of the Croſs:* and the People anſwer *Adoremus, let us worſhip.* pag. 161.

L. But they do not ſay, *let us worſhip it with* SUPREME DIVINE ADORATION, nor do they intend it; ſo go on.

G. And then the *Prieſt* firſt, and afterwards the *People* come upon their knees, and pay their *Adoration* to the *Croſs*. And remember that it is the Adoration of *Latria*, which they give to it. *pag.* 161.

L. I remember it, Sr, in St *Thomas's* Senſe, which I ſhall explain preſently.

G. Now for *Images*, the ſame *Aquinas* before mention'd tells us the Worſhip we pay them is *Religionis Cultus*, a *Religious Worſhip*: And that it is not a different *Latria* which is given to *Chriſt*, and to his *Images*. *Quod Imaginibus Chriſti exhibetur Cultus, non diverſificatur ratio Latriæ, nec Virtus Religionis.* 2da. 2dæ. Queſt. 81. Art. 3. Reſp. ad 3. If then there be but one *Latria*, and the ſame that is paid to *Chriſt* and his *Images*, it will juſtify what *James Naclantus* Biſhop of *Clugium* writes in his Expoſition of the Epiſtle to the *Romans* Ch. 1. that the faithful ought not only to worſhip *before* the *Image* (as ſome perhaps out of Caution ſpeak) but to *worſhip* the *Image itſelf* without any Scruple at all; and with the ſame Sort of Worſhip as the *Prototype*, or whom it repreſents. And if that is to be worſhipped with *Latria*, ſo it's Image with *La-*

» *tria*: if with *Dulia*, or *Hyperdulia*, ſo the Image is » to be worshipped with the ſame Worship.

L. Sr, what explains St *Thomas*, will ſuffice to explain all the reſt, who have only follow'd his Way of Speaking. But a Man muſt have a very ſtrong implicit Faith, who can believe that ſo great a Man (as all the learned World allows St *Thomas Aquinas* to have been) was capable of Teaching that *ſupreme Divine Adoration* is to be paid to a Piece of Wood or Stone.

G. My Lord, he certainly teaches, that the Worship of *Latria* is to be paid to the *Croſs*: But the Worship of *Latria* is *Divine Worship*, therefore he teaches that *Divine Worship* is to be paid to the *Croſs*. I think this Argument is concluſive.

L. Sr, the Worship, which St *Thomas* calls *Latria*, muſt according to his true Meaning be conſider'd under a double Regard: One to *God* himſelf, the other to his *Image*. As it regards God himſelf, it is *ſupreme Divine Adoration*. But as it regards his *Image*, it is no more than an *inferiour relative Honour*, which however terminating ultimately in God is for that Reaſon, as he teaches, a *religious Act* of the ſame *Kind* or *Species* as the Act of Worship which has God for it's immediate Object; and therefore he gives it the ſame Name.

I ſhall explain myſelf by an eaſy Example. There is but one *Theological Virtue* of *Charity*, which is *the Love of God above all Things*. Yet by the *ſame Virtue* we love our *Neighbour* for *God's Sake*. So that the *Act*, or *Virtue*, by which we thus love our *Neighbour*, has a *double Tendency* or *Reſpect*: One to our *Neighbour*, who is the *Image* of *God*; the other to *God* himſelf, *for whoſe ſake* we love him. It may therefore be ſaid in St *Thomas's* Way of Speaking, that when we love the *Image* of *God* in our *Neighbour*, the *Nature* of

Species of the *Virtue* of *Charity* is not different from that, by which *we love God above all Things.*

But would not a Man be grosſly Miſtaken, who should argue thus from it, that ſince there is but *one Virtue* of *Charity*, which is *the love of God above all Things*; therefore, when by *that Virtue* we love our *Neighbour*, it follows, that we love him *above all Things*, and by conſequence pay that *Supreme Love* to the *Image* of *God*, which is due to *God alone?* For would you not readily anſwer by telling him, that thô the *Virtue* of *Charity*, whereby we *love* our *Neighbour for God's Sake*, be of the *ſame Kind* or *Species* with that, by which *we love God above all Things*, yet ſince its *Act* or *Habit* has a *double Tendency*, tis an *inferiour Love*, as it regards the *Image* of *God*, and only the *Supreme Divine Love of Charity*, as it regards the *Prototype?* Now Sr, apply but this to St *Thomas's* Notion of *Latria*, and you will be Senſible how much you have wrong'd both him, and the whole Body of *Roman Catholicks* by concluding from it, that if there be but *one Latria*, *Supreme Divine Adoration* is given to the *Croſs*, and *Images* of *Chriſt*. For you may as well argue thus, that if there be but *one Theological Virtue* of *Charity*, the proper Object whereof is loved above all Things, it follows, that we love our Neighbour *above all Things*, that is, *above God himſelf.*

Hence it follows, that the whole preſent Queſtion is in Reality reduced to this trivial Point, *viz.* whether St *Thomas* and his followers expreſs themſelves properly? Some think they do; others not. But all (excepting our *Proteſtant* Friends, who are glad to catch at any Thing to pick a Quarrel) agree, that St *Thomas* means the ſame as they, who expreſs themſelves otherwiſe: and what aſſures them of this are his own Words in other Parts of his Writings. *Properly* (ſays he) *we don't adore the Croſs,*

but only Christ, who is crucified. Hæb. 11. Lect. 5. And again. *It is Idolatry* (ſays he) *when the honour due to God is given to Images;* ad Coll. 3. Lec. 1. When therefore he ſays that *Latria* is due to the *Croſs*, he muſt of Neceſſity ſpeak of a *relative Latria*, and not of that *Supreme Divine Worship*, which is due to *God alone.*

G. But what do's your Lordship ſay concerning your *Adoration* of the *Croſs* upon *Good Fryday?*

L. I ſay, Sr, that if the Word *Adoration* be taken, as it is generally by *your Church*, for *ſupreme Divine Worship*, we *adore* the *Croſs* no more than you *adore* the *Altar* when you *bow* to it. But if it be taken, as we really underſtand it, for an *inferiour Relative Honour*, nothing but wilful Malice can carp at it.

I deſire you then to obſerve (as Mr *Thorndike* do's very well. Epil. p. 3. p. 353.) that theſe Words, viz. *Adoration, Worship, Honour, Reſpect, or however you tranſlate the Latin Word*, Cultus, *are or may be equivocal in Spite of our Hearts.* That is, ſometimes they may ſignify *one Kind* of *Honour*, and ſometimes *another.* Sometimes that which belongs to *God*, and ſometimes that which belongs to *Creatures.* And *the Cauſe of this Equivocation* (ſays he) *is the Want of Words: Vulgar Uſe not having provided Words properly to ſignify Conceptions, which came not from common Senſes:* And from this *Equivocation* in the Words *Adoration, Worship, &c.* the greateſt Part of *Proteſtant* Objections againſt the *Veneration* we pay to *Saints* and *Images* ariſes; and the whole Streſs of what you ſay concerning our *Worship* or *Adoration* of the *Croſs* upon *Good Fryday*, is grounded upon it.

You know, Sr, our *Liturgy* is in *Latin*; and the *Latin* Word ADORO, thô commonly uſed to ſignify *Divine Worship*, yet both in the *Latin Scripture*,

and *Latin Fathers* it frequently ſignifies no more then an *inferiour Honour*. Thus St *Jerom* ſays, ADORAVI *præſepe & incunabula Salvatoris*. Apol. 2. contra Rufum. *I have worshipp'd the Manger and Crib of our Saviour*. And *Tertullian* uſes the ſame Word, when he ſays, ADORO *Scripturæ plenitudinem*. Lib. cont. Herm. C. 22. *I reverence the Fulneſs of Scriptures*. Thus it is likewiſe ſaid in Scripture, *ſurrexit Abraham, &* ADORAVIT *populum terræ*. Gen. 23. ℣. 7. Which you tranſlate, *Abraham ſtood up, and bow'd himſelf to the People of the Land*. And again, *filii Prophetarum venientes in occurſum Eliſæi* ADORAVERUNT *eum*. 4. Reg. 2. ℣. 15. is tranſlated thus in your Bible. *The Sons of the Prophets came to meet Elisha, and bow'd themſelves to the Ground before him*. And (to omit innumerable other Paſſages of the ſame Sort) that of *Pſalm* 98. ℣. 5. ADORATE *Scabellum pedum ejus*, is likewiſe thus tranſlated by you, *fall down before the Footſtool of God*.

Now theſe are ſufficient Inſtances to ſhew, that the *Latin* Word ADORO frequently ſignifies no more, than an *inferiour Honour*; ſince it is manifeſt, that in the Paſſages I have quoted both from *Scriptures* and *Fathers* it can have no other Signification. And in Effect it ſignifies no more in our *Office* on *Good-Fryday*; And ſo your Objection againſt it is meer Froth, unleſs you can prove more effectually than you have done hitherto, that even an *inferiour Relative Honour* is too much to be given to the *Croſs* or *Images* of *Chriſt*: Tho the very *Jews* were commanded to give it to the *Footſtool of God*, that is, the *Ark*.

Pray, Sr, when you make a *Bow*, and your Women a *low Courteſy* to the *venerable Name* of *Jeſus*, as is appointed by your *Church*, what is the Meaning of it? I preſume you do not pay that *Reſpect*

either to the *Sound*, or to the *Syllables* or *Letters* of that *Word*: But the Ground of the *Reſpect* and *Honour* you pay to it is the *Relation* it has to the *Divine Perſon*, who bears that *Name*. And then I should be glad to know what Difference there is between *your Bowing* to his *Name*, and *our Kneeling* to the *Croſs*, whereon he died! Nay ſuppoſe it were a Cuſtom both for Men and Women to *Kneel down* as often as they heard the *Name of Jeſus* pronounced, it would be no more than what St *Paul* encourages us to do when he tells us, *that God has given him a Name, which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jeſus every knee shall bow*. Philip. 2. ℣. 9. 10.

I know that Dr *Stillingfleet* (of whom you have borrow'd all your fine Arguments to prove us *Idolaters*) to get rid of this troubleſome Parallel between the *Proteſtant Bows* or *Court'ſies* to the *Name of Jeſus*, and our *Kneeling* to the *Croſs* anſwers, *that we might as well inſtance in Going to Church at the Toll of a Bell, as in Bowing at the Name of Jeſus: For, as the one only tells us the Time when, ſo the other only puts us in Mind of the Perſon whom we are to Worſhip*. So that according to this learned *Proteſtant Doctor* no more Reverence is paid to the moſt *holy Name of Jeſus*, when we hear it pronounced, than to a *Bell* when we hear it *toll*. Moſt shamefull Doctrine! And how different from the *Text*, I have juſt now quoted from St *Paul*! I heartily wish the Doctor may not have his Portion with the *Heathen Jupiter*, for whoſe Honour he was ſo zealous in this Life.

But let that be as it will, unleſs you can shew a *Subſtantial Difference* between *Bowing* or Making *low Court'ſies* to the *Name* of *Jeſus*, and *Kneeling* to the *Croſs*, you will never avoid being guilty of a manifeſt *Incoherency* in *Practiſing* the one, and *condemning* the other. For *Kneeling* is an Action as *indifferent* in

itſelf as *Bowing*. Both are in proper Circumſtances made Uſe of to teſtify our *Reſpect* either to *God* or his *Creatures*; and the *Nature* or *Quality* of the *Reſpect*, we ſhew by thoſe Actions, are chiefly diverſified by the *Intention* of the *Will*. So that if *Bowing* to the *Name* of *Jeſus* be no more than an *inferiour Relative Honour*, which terminates wholly in *Chriſt* himſelf, *Kneeling* to and *Kiſſing* the *Croſs* are likewiſe no more. And if this be properly call'd *Worſhipping* the *Croſs*, the other is as properly call'd *Worſhipping* the *Name* of *Jeſus*: Or call it by what *Name* you pleaſe, provided you give the *ſame Name* to both.

§. 37.

Some Touches of prophane Burleſque.

C. MY Lord, there is another ſtrange *Latria* paid to the *præputium* of *Chriſt*, or the *Fore-skin*, that was cut off at his *Circumciſion*. Your Doctors are at great Pains to know what is become of it. They might as well ask what is become of the *Pairings* of his *Nails*. Whither will *Superſtition* run? They had it at *Antwerp*; but the *Hereticks* took it away. From thence it travell'd by many Miracles to the *Church* of St *John Lateran* at *Rome*. And how it was thence tranſlated to the Church of *Cornelius* and *Cyprian* at *Calcata* about twenty Miles from *Rome*, I have read at large the Account in a Book in *Folio* intituled *de Baſilica & Patriarchio Lateranenſi ad Alex. VII. Pont. Max. Authore Caſare Raſpono ejuſdem Baſilicæ Canonico.* Romæ 1656. p. 364. &c. And of the *miraculous* Difference it ſhew'd, when it was touch'd by *Virgins* and by *Marr'd Women*, ſee the *Devotions of the*

» *Roman Church*, pag. 31. Where you will find other » Authors quoted, as *Bolandus*, *Act. Sanct. ad Jan.* 1. » *de præputio Christi.* And *Rivet*: *Apologia pro Sancta* » *Maria Virgine*, Lib. 1. C. 17. Cardinal *Tolet*: in » *Caput* 2. *Lucæ*, *Annot.* 31. And *Salmeron in Evang.* » Tom. 3. Tract. 36. And that tho it is ſtill at *Cal-* » *cata*, yet it is carried about at *Podium* with great » Veneration upon the Feaſt of the *Aſcenſion*. *Sal-* » *meron* in the Place above quoted tells us out of the » *Legend* of *Jacobus de Voragine*, that the *Bleſſed Vir-* » *gin* gave this *Præputium* firſt to *Mary Magdalen*, » and that it was brought afterwards by an *Angel* to » *Charles* the *Great* at *Aken*, and how after it came » to be laid up in the *Lateran*: whence theſe Verſes.

» *Circumciſa Caro Chriſti, Sandalia Sacra,*
» *Atque Umbilici viget hic Preciſio chara.*

» Put thus into English.

» *Chriſt's Fore-skin, and bleſſed Sandals are kept here,*
» *And what was cut from off his Navel dear.*

» I ſuppoſe they meant the Cutting of his *Navel-* » *ſtring*. And his *Sandals* (tho it is not ſaid that he » wore any; for he is always painted bare-foot) » will come in here too for *Latria*, for the ſame » Reaſon, which *Thom. Aquinas* gives for *Latria* as » due to the *Croſs propter Membrorum Chriſti contac-* » *tum*, becauſe it touch'd the *Body* of *Chriſt*. Then » all his *Cloaths* muſt come in for the ſame Reaſon, » and the *Nails* and *Spear* that pierced him. And why » not the *Spittle* that was thrown in his Face? For » the *Croſs* was as much his *Enemy* (as far as *Wood* » could be) as any of the other, or the *Spittle* it- » ſelf. And I know not why the *Crucifiers* ſhould not » be admitted too, tho they touch'd him with an » Hoſtile Mind: as ſome have Sainted *Judas*, becauſe

he

he was an Instrument in our Redemption. For there « is no Stop in *Superstition* more than in other *Arts.* « pag. 162. 163. 164. «

L. Sr, Buffoonery ought at least to have it's Bounds, and keep at a respectful Distance from every Thing belonging to the *sacred Person* of *Christ.* So far ought we to be from Making any Thing relating to him the Subject of *Burlesque.* What a Number of Questions as *undecent* as *prophane* might not an *Atheist* or *Deist* start concerning our Saviour's *Circumcision* and *Passion.* And would you think them worth a serious Answer? Now, Sr, the *Legendary* Stuff you have rehearsed concerning our Saviours *Foreskin* is as impertinent as those Questions would be, and 'tis a Subject not fit to be jested with. And therefore when any of our Authors write of it, let their Relations be as fabulous as you please (for that is beneath my Concern) they observe at least a *Decorum*, and speak not of it like *Jack puddings* in *Bartholemy-faire*, or in the *Ribaldry-Stile* of *Merry Andrews* to make Sport for *Libertines* and *Atheists.*

But as to that *undecent Piece*, for which you quote *the Devotions of the Roman Church*, I am not surpriz'd at any Sort of *Filth* coming from that *Sink* of *Forgeries* and *Scandals.* 'Tis a meer *common Sewer*, into which the Author has convey'd all the *Dirt*, he has with infinite Labour raked together to throw at us.

However one short Answer to all the fine Stories that Author has told, and those you have now entertain'd me with, is, that when you find any of them either in the *Decrees* of *our Councils*, or *Catechisms*, or *Professions of Faith*, or when we insist upon them as *Terms of Communion*, then we are Responsable for them, and not otherwise. So that Telling *Old Wives Stories*, or the indiscreet Disputes or fabu-

lous Relations of *particular Perſons* to ridicule any *Church* is *beneath* a grave *Divine*, and betrays not only a Dearth of ſolid Arguments, but a Miſtruſt of his Cauſe: ſince he is forced to have Recourſe to ſuch vile Means to ſupport it.

As to the *Latria*, which you run ſo much Diſcant upon, I have already ſufficiently explain'd St *Thomas's* Meaning of that Word, and how it may be applied to the Things you make yourſelf merry with. But this I aſſure you, that had I a Handkerchief, which had wiped off the *Spittle* from our *Saviour's Face*, or the *Nails* that pierced his *ſacred Hands* and *Feet*, I ſhould keep them with a ſingular Veneration, and as a moſt *precious Relique* in Remembrance of him: and ſo I would the leaſt *Scrap* of his *Cloaths:* Nor ſhould any *prophane Buffoon* ever make me alter my Mind. How common a Cuſtom is it to keep a *Lock* of a Perſon's *Hair*, whoſe Memory is Dear to us, or even a *Toy* that but belong'd to him? And, if this Practice be grounded upon an *inbred Impreſſion* of *Nature*, and is not thought abſurd in *common Life*, why ſhould it be a *Superſtition* in Religion to have a Veneration for Things, that have any Ways belong'd to our *Divine Redeemer?*

The *Woman*, that was troubled with the *bloody Flux*, had a firm Faith, that if ſhe could but touch the *Hem* of his *Garment*, ſhe ſhould certainly be cured. Now, if the *Apoſtles* had been *Proteſtants* in their *Principles*, they would have upbraided her with *Superſtition.* And how much more would St *Peter* have condemn'd thoſe, that crouded to come within the Reach of his *Shadow*, and St *Paul* thoſe *zealous Devotes*, that brought their *Aprons* and *Handkerchiefs* to *touch* his *Body?* But in thoſe early Days of *Chriſtianity* Men had a *Religious Reſpect* for Things, that but *touch'd* the *Body* of a faithful *Servant of Chriſt.*

Believe me, Sr, they were not in thoſe Days a Subject of *Mirth* and *Laughter:* That Sort of Wit is a Fruit of a later Growth, and was brought into Credit by the bleſſed *Reformation.* Before which Time I find that Men were alſo ſo ſtupidly *Superſtitious*, as to make a Difference between the *Dead Inſtruments* of our *Saviour's Paſſion*, all which they held in Veneration, and his *Crucifiers*, whoſe *Cruelty* and *Malice* they deteſted: Thó your more elevated Genius cannot ſtoop low enough to make theſe Vulgar Diſtinctions between *Things* and *Things*, or between *Things* and *Perſons.*

All the World knows what honours *Antiquity* paid to the *Croſs of Chriſt* on Account of it's being the *Inſtrument* of our *Redemption:* and with what Solemnity St *Helena* the Ancient Glory of *Britain* placed it again upon *Mount Calvary*, after it had diſtinguiſh'd itſelf from the *two Croſſes* found with it under Ground by the *miraculous Cure* of a Woman afflicted with a grievous Diſtemper; And how being afterwards carried away by *Choſroas* King of *Perſia*, was fourteen Years after again recover'd by the Emperor *Heraclius*, who refuſed to make Peace with the *Perſians*, but upon Condition, that they ſhould reſtore the *Croſs*; which himſelf carried on his Shoulders with great Pomp to the Place, where *Chriſt* had ſuffer'd upon it; and the like Honour was in thoſe Days paid to the *Nails*, which faſten'd him to it. But I never heard of any Honours paid by the *Ancient Church* to his *Crucifyers.* Which ſhews, they plainly ſaw a Difference, where you pretend to ſee none, *viz.* between the *Dead Inſtruments* of our *Saviour's Paſſion*, and the *Criminal Actors* in it. But ſome *Ornamental Strokes* of *Buffoonery* are abſolutely Neceſſary to make *Falſehood* go down, and ſupply the *Deficiencies* of ſolid Reaſon.

» *G.* But, My Lord, I muſt not forget my Friends » the *Schoolmen* upon the occaſion I have ſpoken of. » They diſpute, that the *Foreskin* being of the *En-* » *tireneſs* of the *Body*, it muſt have been reunited to » the *Body* of *Chriſt* upon his *Reſurrection*, elſe that » the entire *Body* did not ariſe. *Suarez* therefore con- » cludes, that the *Body* of *Chriſt* at the *Reſurrection* » had a *Foreskin*, which is ſhew'd in the *Church* here » below. He ſays, that the *Foreskin* belongs to the » *Entireneſs* of the *Body non formaliter ſed materiali-* » *ter*, not *formally* but only *Materially*, and ſo the » Buſineſs is made up. But he adds, that *Innocent* » III. did call in Queſtion this *Foreskin* upon Earth. » It is a Queſtion then. And do the People ſtill pay » *Latria* to it? How comes this to be ſuffer'd in the » *Church?* In the *Church*, that is *Infallible!* pag. 164. » 165.

L. And I ask you, Sr, Whether the Church's *Infallibility* obliges her to interpoſe her Authority in all the trivial Queſtions, which *Divines* diſpute *pro* and *con* againſt one another? You are ſometimes very angry at her for *Pronouncing deciſively* in Matters, where she is ſure she has *Authority* to do it; and now you quarrel with her for not Doing it in Matters, wherein she Judges her *Authority* not to be concern'd. So that whether full or faſting, you are equally diſpleas'd.

All then that the *Church* ſuffers is, that they who are convinced in their Hearts, that there is *ſuch* or *ſuch* a *Relique* of our *Saviour* upon Earth, may give it the *Reſpect* that is *due* to it; call it by what *Name* you pleaſe: which ſurely cannot be an Argument againſt her *Infallibility*; unleſs you make this a good Conſequence, *The Church acts prudently, therefore she is not infallible.*

» *G.* But, My Lord, ſeveral Parcels of the *Blood*

of *Chriſt* ſhed upon the *Croſs* are likewiſe ſhew'd; " and *Creſſy* quotes *Math. Paris* for a ſignal Teſti- " mony of it. To this, ſays *Aquinas*, *whatever be-* " *longs to the Nature of an humane Body was wholly in* " *the Body of Chriſt when he roſe, as his Flesh and Bones* " *and his Blood, and that entirely without any Diminu-* " *tion*; *otherwiſe* (ſays he) *it had not been a perfect* " *Reſurrection.* And afterwards, that all the *Blood*, " which flow'd from the *Body* of *Chriſt*, roſe again " in his *Body*. *But as for that Blood* (ſays he) *which* " *is preſerved in ſome Churches for Reliques, it did not* " *flow from Chriſt's Side, but is ſaid to have flow'd mi-* " *raculouſly from a certain Image of Chriſt, that was pier-* " *ced.* Yet the People pay *Latria* to it grounded " wholly upon a *Legend*: And *Aquinas* gives no fur- " ther Aſſurance of it, than that *it was ſaid.* Is this " Worſhipping in *Faith*! What *Blood* was that " which came out of an *Image*? Was it *Chriſt's Blood*? " And how was it made ſo? Was it *tranſubſtantiated*, " or was it Blood *Materially* tho not *formally*? Or " had it only the *Colour* of *Blood*, the *Accidents* re- " maining without *Subſtance*? *Vaſquez* comes pretty " near this when he ſays, *that no Portion of the Blood* " *of Chriſt did remain on Earth under the Form of Blood*, " *but only under it's Colour*, amiſſa forma Sanguinis, " *having loſt the Form of Blood.* pag. 165. 166. "

L. Sr, I am wholly of St *Thomas Aquinas's* Mind, that *Chriſt* at his *Reſurrection* reſumed every Thing requiſite to the *Integrity* of a *Human Body*, As by God's infinite Power every Man will do at the *general Reſurrection.* And I am likewiſe ſo far of *Vaſquez's* Mind, *viz.* that there is no *Blood* of *Chriſt* upon earth but that, which we receive in the *Sacrament* of the holy *Euchariſt.* So that, if the Fact be true (for neither you nor I are bound to believe it) that God, to confound the *ſacrilegious Impiety* of thoſe,

who pierced an *Image* of *Chriſt* in Deriſion or Hatred of him, manifeſted his diſpleaſure in the *Miraculous* Manner as is commonly related; what appears to me moſt probable is, that it was *real Blood* indeed, but not the *Blood* of *Chriſt* that iſſued from it: Which utterly ſpoils the jeſt of all your fine Queſtions. For I find no more Neceſſity either for the *Diſtinction* of *Material* and *Formal*, or for *Tranſubſtantiation*, or *Accidents* remaining without their *Subſtance* in the above-mention'd *Miracle*, than in the *miraculous Flowing* of *Water* from the *Rock*, when *Moſes* ſtruck it with his *Rod*: Becauſe the ſame *Power*, that produced *Water* out of a *Rock*, can ſurely produce *Blood* out of an *Image* of *Wood*. And in ſuch a Caſe the ſame Sort of *Reſpect* is due to the *Blood* produced in that *miraculous* Manner, as to the *Crucifix*, from which it *flows*; becauſe as the one is an Image of *Chriſt Dying*, ſo is the other of his *Shedding his Blood* on the Croſs.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The Gentleman *in his* Caſe ſtated *having a Great Itching to make a witty jeſt upon* Ariſtotle's *Principle of* Privation; *in Order to usher it in decently and with Connection, makes his* Lordſhip *ask this wiſe Queſtion.* What is this Matter and Form, with which they keep ſuch a Stir? *To which the* Gentleman *anſwers as follows.*

G. THey make three *conſtituting Principles* in every Thing. Theſe they call *Materia, Forma, & Privatio.* That is, the *Matter*, of which any Thing is made. The *Form*, which is wholly unknown to us. And the *Want* of that *Form*. For

you muſt know, that we muſt *want* a Thing before we *have* it. *pag.* 166. «

L. Sr, it is no ſmall Overſight in a Pretender to *Logick* to tell me, that *Privation* is one of *Ariſtotle's* CONSTITUENT *Principles*, which ſuffices to anſwer this idle *Jargon*.

G. Yet your Article of *Tranſubſtantiation* is nothing elſe, as I hope I have made it plain. And I will ſhew you another Inſtance, wherein you follow the *Schoolmen* too, and are groſſly miſled by them: that is, the *Diſtinction* of *Concomitancy*. pag. 166. «

L. Sr, you have made it juſt as *plain*, that *Tranſubſtantiation* is a meer *Jargon*, as you have made it plain, that the *Heathen Jupiter* is the *true ſupreme God* adored by *Chriſtians*: and as you have made it *plain*, that our *Men of Senſe* believe neither *Scriptures* nor *Legends*. Truly Sr, if Aſſerting *Falſehoods* boldly be *making* Things *plain*, you have done great Feats in this Converſation. But I muſt tell you plainly, you are in a bad Way at preſent, unleſs you ſucceed better than you have done hitherto, in *making it plain* that the *Diſtinction* of *Concomitancy* is a *Meer Jargon*. Let us then hear, what you have to ſay for yourſelf.

G. I have before told you of ſeveral Injuries done to our *Lord Chriſt* in *Adding* to his *Commandements*, and making to yourſelves *Means of Grace*, which he has not inſtituted. *pag.* 166. «

L. And I have before made it plain to a Demonſtration [part. 2. §. 3. §. 33.] that you have even contradicted the Practice of your *own Church*, upon both thoſe Heads.

§. 38.

Of Concomitancy, and Communion under one Kind.

» *G.* WHat I am to ſpeak of now is an Error on the other Hand, that is, of *ſubſtracting* from his *Inſtitutions*, and the *Means of* » *Grace*, which he has appointed. I mean in Taking » away the *Cup* from the *Laity* in the holy *Sacrament*. » *Chriſt* inſtituted the *Sacrament* of his *Body* and *Blood* » as an effectual *Means* of *Grace*, calling it the *Com-* » *munion* of his *Body* and *Blood*. Particularly of the » *Cup* it is ſaid, *The Cup of Bleſſing, which we bleſs,* » *is it not the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt*, 1. Cor. » 10. ℣. 16. And that we all partake of the *Cup* ac- » cording to ſeveral Manuſcripts of your own *Vulgar* » *Latin. Omnes de uno pane, & de uno Calice partici-* » *pamus*. But that the *Laity* might not think them- » ſelves deprived of this ſo beneficial a *Means* of » the greateſt *Grace*, the *Schools* have invented a » *Diſtinction* they call *Concomitancy*, which is, that in » all *Fleſh* there is ſome *Blood* goes along, or is *con-* » *comitant* with it. So that whoever eat the *Fleſh*, » partake alſo of the *Blood*. pag. 167.

» *L.* Really Sr, I wish you had ſtudied our Divi- nity a little better. What! do we ſay, *that in all Fleſh there is ſome Blood go's along with it!* And is this the Meaning of our Doctrine of *Concomitancy!* I can- not but pity your real or affected Ignorance. But that you may be better inſtructed for the future, what our Divines teach is this, to Wit, that nei- ther a *living Body* can be without *Blood*, nor the *Blood* of a *living incorruptible Body* without the *Body* itſelf. And therefore when the *Laity* receive the *living Body* of *chriſt* under the *Form* of *Bread*, they muſt by Conſe-

Conſequence alſo receive his *ſacred Blood*, which is inſeparable form it: and ſo it is truly call'd *the Communion of his Body and Blood:* nor are they by Conſequence *deprived* of any Part of the *Sacrament*, or of the *Grace* it contains. This Sr, is our Meaning of the *Diſtinction* of *Concomitancy*, which is ſo far from being a *Jargon*, that it is plain *common Senſe*.

You ſay, of the *Cup* it is particularly ſaid by St *Paul*, *the Cup of Bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt?* 1. Cor. 10. ℣. 16. Who doubts it? And in the ſame Verſe it is as particularly ſaid, *And the Bread which we break is it not the Communion of the Body of our Lord?* Now I preſume St *Paul* do's not ſpeak of a *Dead* but a *living Body*, which is neceſſarily compoſed of *Flesh* and *Blood*. Nor can any Man have ſuch a groſs Imagination as to think the *Blood* is *really* ſeparated from the *Body* in the *Cup*, or the *Body* from the *Blood* in the *Hoſt*.

We may likewiſe modeſtly preſume that St *Paul* was no Equivocator, but call'd Things by their own Names. And therefore when he ſaid, *that the Bread and Cup being bleſſed are the Communion of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, he could not mean that they continued to be *plain Bread* and *Wine* after the Conſecration. And ſo his Words are a full Confutation of this impious Error.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Inſtead of the Anſwer now given, his Lordſhip *in the* former Converſation *takes all for Current Coin, and only as's this modeſt Queſtion;* And is not that true? *To which the* Gentleman's *Reply is ſo exorbitantly weak, that the Reader will be ſurpriz'd at it. However he muſt*

take it for Better or for Worſe. His Lordship *therefore having put this Queſtion*, And is not that true? *The* Gentleman *anſwers as follows.*

» *G.* Really, My Lord, I know not. But I am » ſure it is a *Nicety*. For *Flesh* may be ſo *dried*, that » no *Blood* ſhall appear in it; and in a *Wafer* there » can be none without having Recourſe to a *Mira-* » *cle.* pag. 167.

L. But I hope, Dear Sr, there may at leaſt be ſome in the *living Body* of *Chriſt*, which the *faithful* receive *verily* and *indeed* in the Lord's Supper. Unleſs you will ſay, that they receive a *Dead Body* under the *Form* of *Bread*, and *Dead* or *inanimate Blood* under the *Form* of *Wine:* which is both impious and abſurd.

» *G.* I think, My Lord, it is making too bold to » throw off the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* upon ſuch Ima- » ginations of our own, which imply that there » was no need of the *Inſtitution* of the *Cup*. For if » it be not neceſſary now, it was not ſo then. *pag.* » 167.

L. Sr, it is not only *Making too bold* (for that is too ſoft a Term) but *wicked* and *Sacrilegious* to throw off the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* upon any Imagination whatſoever. But do we throw off the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, becauſe we teach that a *living Body* cannot be without *Blood*, nor the *Blood* of a *living Perſon* be ſeparated from his *Body?* And that by Conſequence we receive *whole Chriſt*, whether we receive him under *one* or *both Kinds?*

G. But do's not this make the *Inſtitution* of the *Cup* unneceſſary?

L. No Sr, it do's not. Becauſe the *Euchariſt* is not only a *Sacrament*, that is, a *Sign of inviſible Grace* inſtituted for the Nourishment of our Souls; but alſo

a *Sacrifice*, which is one of the moſt eſſential Parts of Religion. And for this Reaſon *Chriſt* inſtituted the *bleſſed Euchariſt* under *both Kinds*, that by the *Myſtical Separation* of his *Body* and *Blood* upon the *Altar* their *real Separation* on the *Croſs* might be more perfectly repreſented, and ſo be both a ſtanding lively *Memorial* of the *Death* he once ſuffer'd, and a perpetual *Oblation* of infinite Value for us. But many of the *Reformation* have effectually rob'd the People of this *whole Sacrifice* and all it's Fruit by Denying the *real Preſence* of *Chriſt* as a *Victim* under the *Sacramental Signs*, and had no other Way to cover the Impiety of this Fact than by Raiſing a Clamour about the *Cup*, as if without it the People received a *mangled* and *imperfect Sacrament*: whereas nothing is more falſe; becauſe by Receiving the *Living Body* of *Chriſt* they are made as much Partakers of his *ſacred Blood*, as if they received it under *both Kinds*.

G. But, My Lord, this *Sacrament* was ordained « not only to expreſs the *Death* of *Chriſt*, but alſo « the Manner of it: that is, by the *Shedding* of his « *Blood* according to the *Bloody Types* of him under « the *Law*, as it is ſaid, *without Shedding of Blood* « *there is no Remiſſion.* Hæb. 9. ℣. 22. *It was therefore* « *neceſſary*, ſays the Apoſtle. But whatever *Blood* may « be *concomitant* in the *Flesh*, yet there is no *Shedding* « of it expreſs'd in a *Wafer*. pag. 168. «

L. Sr, not in a Wafer remaining *true Bread* after, as it was before the Conſecration. But if the *Bread* and *Wine* be by the *Words of Chriſt* converted into his ſacred *Body* and *Blood* (as they moſt certainly are, unleſs you can prove *Chriſt* to be an *Equivocator* or *Liar*) the ſeparate Conſecration of them, which belongs to Prieſts alone, is the moſt lively Expreſſion both of his *Death* and the *Man-*

ner of it: that is, by the *mystical Shedding of his Blood*. But if neither the *Bread* be by Conſecration converted into his *Body*, nor the *Wine* into his *Blood*, I should be glad to know, how *this Shedding of his Blood according to the bloody Types of him under the Law* can be expreſs'd by it. And I leave every Man to Judge, whether he who talks of nothing but the *Fleſh* and *Blood* of *Chriſt* in the *Sacrament*, and believes nothing conformably to the natural and obvious *Meaning* of his Words, be not guilty of damnable Hypocriſy and Diſſimulation?

» *G.* But, My Lord, when the *Hoſt* is carried in » Proceſſion, as upon *Corpus Chriſti* Day or fre» quently to the Sick, there is no *Cup*, nor do's » the Prieſt himſelf communicate. But however if » the People are to partake of the Sacrifice as it » was under the Law, here they are defrauded of » one Half of it. *pag.* 168.

L. But Sr, when the *Hoſt* is carried in Proceſſion or to the Sick, it either is *Chriſt's Body* or not. If not, then neither is the *Cup* his *Blood*. And ſo according to this *Proteſtant Syſtem* your People are downright bubbled; imagining they receive both *Chriſt's Body and Blood*, when in Effect they receive neither. But if the *Hoſt* be *Chriſt's real Body*, I am ſure it is not a *dead one*; nor are they by Conſequence, who receive it, defrauded of *one Half* either of the *Sacrament* or *Sacrifice*. Pray would the People under the *Old Law* have been defrauded of *half the Sacrifice*, in Caſe the whole Victim had been given to all, and to every particular Perſon? Now tho this be an impoſſible Suppoſition in Reference to the *Sacrifices* of the *Moſaick Law*, 'tis literally true in Reference to the *Chriſtian Sacrifice*. For the *whole Victim*, I mean, the *entire Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt* is given to every Chriſtian Communicant, in what-

ever Manner he receives it, that is, whether by the *Action* of *Eating*, or *Drinking*. For *Chriſt* in his *impaſſible* and *immortal* State cannot be divided, and we either receive *whole Chriſt*, or nothing of him. So that whoever receives his *ſacred Body* receives his *Blood*: And whoever receives his *ſacred Blood*, receives his *Body*: For he neither receives *Dead Fleſh*, nor *Dead* or *inanimate Blood*. And this is what we call *Concomitancy*. And by Conſequence it is not only Calumny, but rank Nonſenſe to ſay the People are defrauded of *one Half* of the *Sacrament*.

G. My Lord, the People are as much commanded to partake of the *Cup* as of the *Bread*. And the *Church* may as well take away the *Bread*, and leave only the *Cup* and ſay, that the *Fleſh* is contain'd in the *Blood*, as well as the *Blood* in the *Fleſh*. Strange Power of the *Church*! What *Inſtitution* of *God* can ſtand at this Rate? Suppoſe the *Jews* had neglected to pour out or Sprinkle the *Blood* of the *Sacrifices* as commanded, and ſaid it was ſufficient that it was by *Concomitancy* in the *Fleſh*, would this *Diſtinction* have ſerved in that Caſe? And why not as well as in this? *pag.* 168. 169.

L. Sr, if the *Jews* had neglected to *pour out* or *ſprinkle* the *Blood* as *commanded*, they would have been guilty of a grievous Sin in Diſobeying the expreſs command of God: nor could the Pretence of *Concomitancy* have in any Manner palliated their Diſobedience: nay it would have been ridiculous in the higheſt Degree; becauſe it is impoſſible that the Blood of a Victim *really* ſhed (as it was by the Prieſts of the old Law) ſhould at the ſame Time remain in the Victim; but it is abſolutely neceſſary that the Blood of Chriſt, which is only ſhed *Myſtically* by the Prieſts of the new Law, ſhould remain really united to his Body. The Conſequence whereof is, that the

People receiving his *living Body* receive his ſacred Blood *concomitantly*: Which ſhews your Parity to be entirely void of Senſe. For it implies two Parts equally abſurd. *Firſt*, that as the Blood was not by *Concomitancy* in the *dead Victims* of the Law, ſo neither is it by *Concomitancy* in the *living Body* of Chriſt. And *2dly*, that as the *Jewiſh* Prieſts were bound to pour out or ſprinkle the Blood of the Sacrifices, ſo the Prieſts of the new Law are bound to give the *Cup* to the People. And is not this fine Stuff?

There are indeed two Parities that may be fairly made; for they contain two ſolid Truths. The *firſt* is, that as the Prieſts of the *old Law* would have been guilty of a grievous Diſobedience, if they had neglected to ſhed the Blood of the Victim *really* under Pretence of *Concomitancy* in the Fleſh, ſo the Prieſts of the *new Law* would incur the like Guilt, if in celebrating the Myſteries they ſhould by not conſecrating the Wine ſeparately neglect to ſhed the Blood of Chriſt *Myſtically* under Pretence of it's *Concomitancy* in the Hoſt. The *2d* is, that as the Obligation of ſhedding the Victim's Blood *really* regarded the *Jewiſh Prieſts* only, and not the People in the old Law, ſo the Obligation of Shedding the Blood of Chriſt *Myſtically* regards *Prieſts* alone, and not the People in the new Law. Theſe two Parities, I ſay, are juſt and fair, but they can render you no Manner of Service.

You ſay, *the Church may as well take away the Bread and leave only the Cup, and ſay that the Fleſh is contain'd in the Blood as well as the Blood in the Fleſh.* Moſt certainly, Sr, the *Church* not only *may* but *do's* ſay, that the *All-glorious* and *incorruptible Body* of *Chriſt* is as inſeparable from his *Blood*, as his *Blood* is from his *Body*: And ſhe ſays this becauſe ſhe is

convinced, that neither the *Bread* is conſecrated into *Dead Flesh*, nor the *Wine* into *Dead* or *inanimate Blood*. And therefore, if the *Church* had the ſame *rational* Motives to give only the *Cup* to the *Laity* as ſhe has to give them only the *conſecrated Bread*, ſhe might lawfully do it. And if ſhe did, the *People* would receive the *ſame Body* and *Blood of Chriſt* whole and *entire* as they now do: Nor would there be the leaſt Difference in the *Thing received*, but only in the *Manner* of *Receiving*.

But here you cry out, *Strange Power of the Church! What Inſtitution of God can ſtand at this Rate!* Sr, as long as there are true *Biſhops* and *Prieſts* in the World who derive their *Ordination* from the *Apoſtles*, the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* is in no Danger of Failing. So that your vehement Exclamation had been very much to the Purpoſe had it been worded thus; *Strange Inſolence and Impiety of a few wretched Reformers, who by Denying the real Preſence of Chriſt's Body and Blood in the Euchariſt have done what in them lies to abolish that Auguſt and Venerable Sacrifice, which Chriſt himſelf inſtituted and left by his laſt Will as the moſt precious Legacy he could beſtow upon his holy Church!* For if ſuch Wickedneſs can be juſtified, we may with Reaſon ask, *What Inſtitution of God can ſtand at this Rate!*

G. But, My Lord, are not the People as much commanded to partake of the *Cup*, as of the *Bread?*

L. Sr, if by *Partaking of the Cup as well as of the Bread* you mean, *receiving the Blood of Chriſt as well as his Body*, I anſwer they are commanded to receive the one as well as the other, and ſo they do by Receiving the *Sacrament* in *one Kind* only. Becauſe the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt* are inſeparable; nor is it poſſible to receive the one without receiving the

other; both *Body* and *Blood* being contain'd under *either Kind*.

G. But if the Church can take away *one Kind* from the People; may she not exert her Power a Step farther and take away *both*?

L. No, Sr, she cannot. Because the People are commanded to receive the *Body and Blood of Christ*. And this they could not do, if both the one Kind and the other were refused them. But as long as they receive the Sacrament in *either Kind*, they fully obey the Command of *Christ* in Receiving both his *Body and Blood*, which is all that is commanded. Nay I defy you to shew any positive Precept obliging the *Laity* to receive it in *both Kinds*.

§. 39.

Lay-communion *in* one *or* both Kinds *is a Point of* Discipline *only*; *and neither forbid*, *nor commanded by* Christ.

» *G.* MY Lord, it is observable that *Christ*, as » foreseeing this taking away of the Cup » from many, added the Word *All* to the Drinking » of the Cup. *Drink ye all of it*. Math. 26. *v.* 27. And » it is said, *they drank All of it*, Mark 14. *v.* 23. it is » not said so of the *Bread*. pag. 169.

L. Sr, since you are in your observing Mood, give me Leave to make my Observation too. *viz.* that *Christ*, as foreseeing that you and other *Protestants* would start this frivolous Objection against the *Discipline* of his *holy Church*, took Care that both St *Mark* and St *Luke* should furnish her with a solid Answer to it. For who were the *All* St *Mathew* speaks of? Were they not the same *All*, as are spoken of by St *Mark* saying, *and they all drank of it*, viz. the *Apostles*,

Apoſtles, who were the only Perſons with our Saviour at his laſt Supper. For ſurely if the Apoſtles alone were the *All* that drank, they were likewiſe the *ſame All*, that *were bid to drink*. A ſtrange Argument to prove, that the *Laity* are *all* bound to drink of the Cup!

G. But is it not remarkable, that *Chriſt* ſhould in Diſtributing the *Bread* ſay no more than *take and eat*; yet in Giving the *Cup* ſhould ſay expreſly, *drink ye All of it*?

L. Sr; St *Luke* has inſinuated a Reaſon for it, which utterly ſpoils the Force of your Obſervation. For he obſerves, that *Chriſt* himſelf *divided* the *Bread*, and gave to each *Apoſtle* the Morſel he was to eat. *Luke* C. 22. ℣. 19. So that all were not to *eat* of the ſame *Piece* of *Conſecrated Bread*: But all were to *drink* of the *ſame conſecrated Cup*; which therefore (according to St *Luke's* Relation) he gave them, and bid them *divide it among themſelves*. ℣. 17. And this explains thoſe Words of St *Mathew*, *drink ye* ALL *of it*; which was only ſaid to caution them, that they were all to have their *Share* of the *Cup* he gave them: whereas this Caution was unneceſſary as to the conſecrated *Bread*, which he diſtributed with his own Hands.

G. But if theſe two Texts, *take and eat*, and *drink ye all of it*, regard the *Apoſtles alone*, you may ſay of the *Bread* as of the *Cup*, and take that too from the *Laity* by the ſame Rule. And you take the *Cup* from the *Prieſts*, who do not officiate. *pag.* 169.

L. Sr, it is plain that the Word *All* in this Text *Drink ye all of it*, regarded the *Apoſtles alone*; becauſe *they alone* were the Perſons, whom *Chriſt* commanded to drink of that *conſecrated Cup*, which he handed to them, and bid them *divide it among themſelves*. But,

the *Inſtitution* itſelf of the *Euchariſt* regarded the *whole Church*; that is, all the Faithful; tho not *all* in the ſame Manner. For, as it is a *Sacrifice*, the *Inſtitution* regarded the *Apoſtles* immediately, and in them all *Biſhops* and *Prieſts* deriving their Ordination from them. But as it is a *Sacrament*, the *Inſtitution* regarded the *People* alſo, who therefore are bound to receive it for the *Spiritual Nouriſhment* of their Souls; But their *Manner* of *Receiving* it, that is, whether by the *Action* of *Eating* or *Drinking* or *both*, is not determined by the *Inſtitution* itſelf.

» *G.* But, My Lord, *Chriſt* ſaid to the *People*, to » the *Laity*, *except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man*, » *and drink his Blood*, *you ſhall have no Life in you.* » Joh. 6. ℣. 53. And this is underſtood by all you of » the *Church* of *Rome* as ſpoken of the Sacrament. » *pag.* 169.

L. Sr, they, who underſtand this *Text* of the *Sacrament*, do likewiſe underſtand all that has a Relation to the ſame Subject in the Chapter from whence it is quoted: Which being ſuppoſed, your Obſervation, that *Chriſt* ſpoke thoſe Words to the *People*, will do you no Service: becauſe the reſt of that Chapter was ſpoke to the *People* as well as thoſe Words.

Now, as Chriſt ſaid to the People, *except you eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood you ſhall have no Life in you.* ℣. 53. And as it is ſaid, *whoſo eateth my Fleſh and drinketh my Blood hath eternal Life.* ℣. 58. So at the ſame Time he ſaid to the People, *If any Man* EAT *this* BREAD *he ſhall live for ever; and the* BREAD *that I will give is my Fleſh, which I will give for the Life of the World.* ℣. 52. And again. *He that* EATETH *me ſhall live by me.* ℣. 58. And thirdly. *He that* EATETH *this* BREAD *ſhall live for ever.* ℣. 59. In which *three Texts* not a Word is ſaid of the

Cup, or of the *Action* of *Drinking*, but only of *Eating* the *Bread*.

Now to reconcile theſe with the other *two Texts*, where the *Cup* and *Drinking* are mention'd, it muſt neceſſarily be ſaid, that by *Eating* and *Drinking* is only meant the *Action* of RECEIVING the *Body and Blood of Chriſt*, and not preciſely the *Manner* of *Receiving* it: And ſo the *Precept* with Reſpect to the *Laity* regards not the *Way* or *Manner* of *Receiving*, but only the *Thing received*. Nay nothing can be more rational than this Interpretation of the foremention'd Texts: Becauſe the only Drift of our Saviour's Diſcourſe was to convince the Disbelieving *Capharnaites*, that unleſs their Souls were nourish'd with the real *Flesh* and *Blood* of the *Son of Man*, they ſhould not have *Life everlaſting*, and that they, who were made *Partakers* of his *Body* and *Blood*, ſhould have *Life everlaſting*. So that provided the *real Body and Blood* of *Chriſt* be but received, whether it be by the *Action* of *Eating*, or of *Drinking only*, or by *both* together, it is Manifeſt, that all worthy Communicants, as they receive *whole Chriſt*, who is the Fountain of *Grace* and *eternal Life*, ſo they fully ſatisfy the *End* of *Chriſt's Inſtitution*, and perform all that is obligatory in the *Precept* of *Communion*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Inſtead of this Anſwer, which delivers the true Senſe of our Saviour's Words in St John, *his* Lordſhip *in the* Gentleman's Caſe ſtated *contents himſelf with one of* Bellarmin's *ſupernumerary Anſwers; which tho defenſible, is uſeleſs and Superfluous. But the* Gentleman *had a Mind to be merry; and his* Lordſhip *was to give him a Handle for it; which he do's very opportunely*

in Telling him, that Bellarmin *ſays, that in this Text*, except you eat, *&c.* and drink, *&c. the Word* And *is to be taken for* Or: *wherewith the* Gentleman *diverts himſelf in the following Manner.*

» *G.* That is to ſay, I may underſtand all the *Ands* » in the *Creed* to be *Ors*; and inſtead of I believe this » *and* this, I may ſay I believe this *or* this. So that, if » I believe any *one Article* it is ſufficient, tho I believe » never another. If you ſend your Servant to Market, » and bid him bring *Beef* and *Mutton* and *Pork*, » and he buys only *Beef*, and ſays, he underſtood » all your *Ands* for *Ors*. And ſo if you bid him » bring ſo much *Meat* and ſo much *Drink*, and he » brings only *Meat* for the ſame Reaſon. Thus we » may eaſily get over all the Commands of God, » and give the Reverſe to St *James*, that *he who offends in one Point is guilty of all.* No, but *he who keeps one Point, keeps the whole Law.* This is *Bantering* » inſtead of *Arguing*. And it ſhews a Cauſe to be » very Deſtitute, when ſo great a Man as *Bellarmin* » could content himſelf with Giving ſuch an An» ſwer. *pag.* 169. 170.

L. Sr, I may truly ſay, *this* is *Bantering* inſtead of *Arguing*. Nay I perceive you are ſeiz'd with ſuch a violent Fit of Drollery, that you chooſe to forfeit your Judgment rather than loſe your jeſt. For, tho I am not diſpoſed to eſpouſe *Bellarmin's* Anſwer for the beſt that can be given, I cannot think he deſerves the ſharp Reflections, you have made upon him. What Sr! if the Word *And* may be taken in a *Disjunctive Senſe*, and underſtood for *Or* in *one Text* of Scripture, do's it therefore follow, that it may be ſo underſtood in *all Texts* whatſoever, and the whole *Creed*? Can a Man of Senſe be capable

of Arguing in this Wild Manner? Ought you not at leaſt to have firſt proved, that *Bellarmin's* Interpretation of the aforeſaid *Text* is wholly groundleſs and precarious, before you ventured to crow over him at that unmerciful Rate?

But Sr, I ſhall inſtance in a *Text*, wherein the Word *And* muſt be taken *disjunctively*, and underſtood for *Or*. The *Text* I mean are theſe Words of St *Peter*, *Gold and Silver I have none*. Act. 3. ℣. 6. I omit others of the ſame Kind for Brevity's Sake. But it is plain, that in this Text the Word *And* cannot but ſignify the ſame as *Or* to make St *Peter's* Words bear this Senſe, *I have neither Gold nor Silver*, which doubtleſs is the true one. And do's it therefore follow, that all the *Ands* in *Scripture* muſt ſignify the ſame as *Or*? Or is there any Ground for your merry Banter of Sending a Servant to the Market for *Beef*, and *Mutton*, and *Pork*?

G. But, My Lord, what Reaſon had *Bellarmin* to ſay, that *And* ſignifies the ſame as *Or* in the Text, we have under Debate?

L. Sr, you ought to have examined that before you made yourſelf ſo Merry with a Man of his Learning. However to ſatisfy you, he grounded himſelf upon our *Saviour's* own Words in the very Chapter, whence the Text in Queſtion is taken, and where *Chriſt* promiſes *eternal Life* no leſs than *thrice* to thoſe, that ſhall *eat* the *Bread*, which himſelf explains to be his *Flesh* ℣. 15. without ſo much as Mentioning the *Cup*, or the *external Action* of *Drinking*. Whence *Bellarmin* juſtly concludes, that if this Precept, *except ye eat the Flesh and drink the Blood, &c.* regards the *External Forms* of *Eating* and *Drinking*, they muſt be underſtood *disjunctively* to reconcile them with the *other three Texts*.

This, Sr, ſuffices to ſhew, that *Bellarmin's* Anſwer

is not ſo abſurd, as you have repreſented it in your merry Mood. And I ſhould make no Difficulty to prefer this Anſwer, were I not convinced, that by *Eating and Drinking* is meant no more than RECEIVING *both the Body and Blood of Chriſt into our Stomachs.* For, as this fully anſwers the *End* of *Chriſt's Inſtitution*, ſo is it an entire Fulfilling of the *Precept* of *Communion*; which regards not the *Manner* of *Receiving*, but the *Things received*: becauſe they are the Things received that give *eternal Life*, and not the *Formality* or *outward Actions*, with which we receive them. This Common ſenſe alone ſuffices to convince us of, and the Doctrine of *Concomitancy* is a Sequel of it.

» *G.* My Lord, the Doctrine of *Concomitancy* will » not do here. For, if I eat a Piece of *Flesh*, ſuppoſe » ſome *Blood* may be ſaid to be *concomitant* there, yet » I cannot be ſaid to *drink*, where there is not a » *Drop.* pag. 170.

L. What Sr! is there not a *Drop* of *Blood* in the *real, Living*, and *incorruptible Body* of *Chriſt!* Or do we eat *Pieces* cut from it, as we do *Butchers-Meat!* Strange wilful Ignorance!

» *G.* My Lord, the Threatning is, except ye » *drink*, there is no Life in you. *pag.* 170.

L. Yet *Chriſt* tells us at the ſame Time, that *he that eateth this Bread ſhall live for ever.* Which is a Demonſtration, that by *Eating and Drinking* is effectually meant RECEIVING *both his Body and Blood*: tho his *Blood* be not convey'd into the Stomach by that *material Action*, which in Receiving ordinary Liquids is call'd *Drinking.*

» *G. If it be but a Man's Teſtament* (ſays St *Paul*) » *yet if it be confirmed, no Man diſannulleth, or addeth* » *thereto.* Gal. 3. ℣. 15. This holy *Sacrament* was the » *laſt Teſtament*, which *Chriſt* left to his *Church* inſti- » tuted the Evening before he enter'd upon his ſa-

cred *Paſſion*. Therefore Pope *Gelaſius* (*apud Gra-* «
tianum) had good Reaſon to call it *Sacrilege* in «
any, who ſhould mutilate this *Sacrament*, and «
commanded that they, who would not *drink* the «
Cup, ſhould be deny'd the *Bread* too. *pag.* 170. «
171. «

L. Sr, not only Pope *Gelaſius*, but all the Popes that ever were in the World have judg'd it *Sacrilege* to *mutilate* the *Sacrament*. But will you know the *true Reaſon*, why Pope *Gelaſius* commanded certain Perſons to receive both the *conſecrated Bread* and *Wine*?

G. I never heard a tolerable *Reaſon* for Taking «
the *Cup* from the *Laity*, except becauſe they were «
the *Laity*. But the Diſpute is not about the *Rea-* «
ſons for it, but the Thing itſelf. To take away «
the *Cup* is to *mutilate* the *Sacrament*: And this is «
Sacrilege by *Gelaſius* his Determination. *pag.* 171. «

L. Sr, I tell you once more, that to *mutilate* the *Sacrament* is *Sacrilege* in the Judgment not of Pope *Gelaſius* only, but of all *Catholicks* in the World. But where will you find it determined by Pope *Gelaſius*, that *Lay-communion* in *one Kind* is *Mutilating* the *Sacrament*? This trivial Circumſtance you have wholly overlook'd.

G. My Lord, I have refer'd you to his *Decree* in *Gratian*.

L. Who is of no Authority amongſt us. But if you will needs refer me to that *Decree*, you muſt be content to take the *Gloſs* along with it, which will ſet the Matter in it's true Light. *There were certain Prieſts* (ſays the *Gloſs*) *who duly conſecrated the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and received the Hoſt, but abſtain'd from the Cup: Which Gelaſius being ſurpriz'd at ſaid, he could not imagine through what Superſtition they did ſo: and commanded them, that they ſhould either receive*

both as they consecrated both, or abstain both from Consecrating and Receiving. Because it is Sacrilege in a Priest offering Sacrifice to receive one without the other. And pray what Reference has this to *Lay-Communion*, or the Point in Question?

§. 40.

The Decrees *of the* Councils *of* Constance *and* Trent *concerning* Communion *in* one Kind *are not contrary to* Christ's Institution, *nor the* Faith *of the* primitive Church.

» *G.* THe *Testament* of our Lord, which was *confirm'd* by the *Practice* of the *Church* for » fourteen hundred Years, was *mutilated* by the » *Council* of *Constance*, and the *Cup* taken from the » *Laity* with a *non-obstante* as well to the *Institution* » of *Christ*, as the *Practice* of the *Primitive Church*. It » was declared no *Sacrilege*, and the *Priest* was ex» communicated, who should communicate the » *Laity* under *both Kinds*.

» The *Council* of *Trent* likewise puts in it's *Caveat* » to the *Institution* in *both Kinds*, and (*that notwith*» *standing*) the *Laity* must be excluded from the » *Cup*: and they make it a *Heresy* to say that *whole* » *Christ* is not under *each Species*. Then the *Flesh* is » as much in the *Blood*, as the *Blood* in the *Flesh*, » and it is all one, which *Species* we take. But since » the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* were *separated* at his » *Death*, and he ordain'd them to be so *separated* in » the *Sacrament* of it, I see not how we can take » away either *Part* upon the Account of their being » not *separated*. pag. 171. 172.

L. Sr, I shall consider your last Words first; which have something in them very extraordinary.

For

For tho you have ſaid many unwarantable Things, nothing can be more ſurprizing than what you tell now, viz. *that ſince the Body and Blood of Chriſt were ſeparated at his Death, and he ordain'd them to be ſo ſeparated in the Sacrament of it, you ſee not how we can take away either Part upon the Account of their being not ſeparated.*

What Sr! Has Chriſt ordain'd his Body and Blood to be ſo ſeparated in the *Sacrament*, as they were at his *Death*! If ſo, then as they were really ſeparated at his Death, ſo are they really and truly (not *Myſtically* only, as we ſay) ſeparated in the Sacrament. And ſince a real Separation of Blood from the Body deſtroys the Life of it, it follows that Chriſt, tho *impaſſible* and *immortal*, has ordain'd himſelf to be deſtroy'd as really in the Sacrament, as he ſuffer'd Death upon the Croſs. So that according to this Doctrine we receive a *dead Corps* in the *conſecrated Hoſt*, and *dead* or *inanimate Blood* in the *conſecrated Wine*.

This, Sr, is the monſtrous Aſſertion you are driven to, at leaſt in Appearance, by Denying our Doctrine of *Concomitancy*. I ſay *in Appearance*; becauſe I cannot think you ſo mad as to mean it in Earneſt; tho you expreſs it plainly in Words. For reflecting with myſelf that in our preſent Diſpute I muſt not underſtand your Words according to their uſual ſignification, I eaſily perceive you have a Loophole to creep out at; *viz.* that when you mention the *Body of Chriſt* in the *Sacrament* you mean nothing but a Morſel of *Bread*: and when you mention the *Blood of Chriſt*, and repeat it over and over again, and ſeem highly concern'd at our *Laity's* being deprived of it, you mean no more than a Sup of *Wine*: and to be ſure there is no Abſurdity in Maintaining, that the *Bread* and *Wine* are as really ſeparated in the *Sa-*

crament, as Christ's *Body and Blood* were at his *Death*.

This I presume is your *Salvo* to come off with. But the Remedy is as bad as the Disease. For can any Thing betray a greater Insincerity, than to speak of the *Sacrament* as *Papists* do, and call it the *Body and Blood of Christ* twenty Times over, and yet mean nothing either of what they mean, or what the Words import of themselves? Do's it not shew, that in a Point of the greatest Consequence you dare not speak out, or call Things by their proper Names? And what can be the Reason of this Dissimulation, but a just Fear least the People, who are not only taught in their Catechisms, *that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received in the Lord's Supper*, but are accustom'd to hear his *Body* and *Blood* continually spoken of in their *Communions*, should become sensible of the Cheat that is put upon them, if you should tell them in plain Words that there is nothing but *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Sacrament*? For, unless this be your Belief and real Meaning; that is, unless you mean *Bread*, when you say *Body*; and *Wine*, when you say *Blood*: you cannot avoid being guilty of the gross Absurdity I have charged you with when you say, *that Christ ordain'd his Body and Blood to be so separated in the Sacrament, as they were at his Death.*

For this Reason the *Council* of *Trent* defined it to be *Heresy* (they might have call'd it *Blasphemy*) to say *that whole Christ is not received under each Kind:* which you object as an Absurdity; as you likewise do what follows from it; viz. *that then the Body of Christ is as much join'd with his Blood, as the Blood with his Body.* But if these be Absurdities, then it follows, that they who believe *that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received in the*

Lord's Supper, muſt believe that they receive *one Half* of Chriſt under one Kind, and the *other Half* under the other Kind.

Whence I conclude, that you cannot avoid one of theſe three Things. Either you muſt own, that you don't believe *the Body and Blood of Chriſt to be verily and indeed taken and received in the Lord's Supper*; and then you both contradict your Church which teaches that Doctrine, and your own plain Words ſo often repeated in this Diſpute calling it the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt* in the *Sacrament*, and arguing from it againſt our taking the *Cup* from the *Laity*: or you muſt maintain, that *one Half* of Chriſt is received under *one Kind*, and the *other Half* under the other *Kind* or *ſpecies*, which is moſt impiouſly and ſuperlatively abſurd: Or you muſt be content to take up with the *Jargon* of *Concomitancy* as you call it, and confeſs fairly that the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt* being inſeparable in this his glorious and immortal State, the one cannot be without the other. The firſt makes you both a rank *Calviniſt* and profeſs'd *Equivocator*, the ſecond a Madman, and the third a *Papiſt*. chooſe which you pleaſe.

G. But, My Lord, what do you ſay to the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Trent* taking away the *Cup* with a *non-obſtante* both to the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, and the Practice of the primitive Church? This I think was a bold Attempt, and wholly unjuſtifiable.

L. Sr, they who can ſee no Difference between *inſtituting* both Kinds, and *Commanding* both Kinds to be received by *All*, muſt be wilfully blind. *Chriſt* inſtituted and adminiſtred the *Sacrament* at *Supper*; but we are not *commanded* to take the Sacrament at Supper, tho it be expreſſly call'd *the Lord's Supper*. The whole Queſtion then is reduced to this Point, viz. whether all be *commanded* to receive the Sacra-

ment in *both Kinds*? And whether the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Trent* took away the Cup with a *non-obſtante* to the *Command of Chriſt*? Which we flatly deny as a Thing unjuſtifiable and impious in itſelf: Tho *Proteſtants* do what they can to perſuade the People that this is the true Meaning of the *Councils Non-obſtante*: Which in Effect is Repreſenting that *Council* to have been no better than an Aſſembly either of *Atheiſts* or *Madmen*. For who but *Atheiſts* or *Madmen* are capable of making a Decree like this? Viz. *Notwithſtanding that Chriſt has commanded all Men to receive the Sacrament in both Kinds, it ſhall be given in one Kind only to the People.* Surely a Man muſt renounce his Reaſon to Judge, that an Aſſembly of *Chriſtian Biſhops* and *Paſtors* in their Senſes ſhould combine together to make ſuch a Mad and impious Decree in the Face of the whole World.

The true Meaning therefore of the *Council* is, that tho *Chriſt inſtituted* or *conſecrated both Kinds*, that both might be offer'd in *Sacrifice*, yet there being no *Command* that obliges *all* to receive *both Kinds*, the *Council* order'd for juſt Reaſons that the *Sacrament* ſhould be adminiſter'd to the *Laity* in *one Kind* only: as the ſame *Council* order'd, that tho *Chriſt* had *inſtituted* and *adminiſter'd* the *Sacrament* at *Supper*, all ſhould be obliged to receive it *Faſting* (Perſons dangerouſly ſick alone excepted) and *your Church* diſpenſes with that Circumſtance of the *Inſtitution* no leſs than ours.

Now, Sr, as to the *Practice* of the *Primitive Church* (which by an *Hyperbole* of a very large Size you have extended to fourteen hundred Years) no Man doubts, but that *publick Communions* in *both Kinds* were practiſed by the *primitive Church*: Tho the common Practice of them was forborn long before the *Council* of *Conſtance*, which *only* made that Diſcipline

obligatory, which it found eſtabliſh'd before in moſt Places by *Cuſtom*. As appears from the Preface to it's Decree, Seſſ. 14. whereby it was render'd every where uniform.

But let that be as it will, if our Diſpute is to be decided by the *Practice* of the *primitive Church*, you certainly loſe your Cauſe. I go upon *two Principles*, which no *Proteſtant* will deny. 1. That the *Commands* of *Chriſt* cannot be *reverſed* or *violated* upon any Pretence whatever. And 2. That adminiſtring *half a Sacrament* is a *Sacrilege*, which no Neceſſity can excuſe. From theſe two Principles I infer that it was the undoubted Judgment of the *primitive Church*, that Adminiſtring the Sacrament in *one* or *both Kinds* is a Matter of *Diſcipline* only; whence it follows, that the *Council* of *Conſtance* could legally forbid *Lay-communion* in *both Kinds*, tho the contrary was practiſed in the *primitive Church*.

G. But, My Lord, how can we know the *Judgment* of the *Church* but from her *Practice*? If therefore *Lay-communion* in *both Kinds* was generally practiſed, as you own it was, in the *primitive Church*, muſt we not conclude she Judg'd the Practice of it *Neceſſary*?

L. Sr, you may conclude she Judg'd it *lawful*, which no Body denies. But the Queſtion is, whether she did not Judge *Communion* in *one Kind* as *lawful* as in *both*? The Queſtion is, whether it was her Judgment, that there is a *poſitive Command* of *Chriſt*, which obliges *all* to receive the *Sacrament* in *both Kinds*, and that it is *mutilated* when it is received in *one Kind* only? Finally the Queſtion is, whether it was not the Judgment of the *primitive Church*, that to receive in *one* or *both Kinds* is a Thing *indifferent* in itſelf? If ſo, then she could not Judge both Kinds *Neceſſary*.

Now here you have her *Judgment* positively againſt you, if that may be certainly known by her *Practice*. For it appears from undoubted Facts, that in the *primitive* Ages the *Sacrament* was received ſometimes in *both Kinds*, ſometimes in *one*. I need not prove the *former*, and the *latter* is manifeſt from three undeniable Inſtances: For I omit ſeveral others for Brevity's Sake.

1. In the Communion of *Infants*, who were allow'd to drink of the *Cup* without Receiving the *conſecrated Hoſt*. Cyp. L. de Lapſis. 2. In *Domeſtick Communions:* The Faithful being permitted by Reaſon of the Perſecutions to carry *conſecrated Hoſt's*, but not the *conſecrated Wine* to their own Houſe for *private Communions*. Tertul. L. 2. ad *Uxorem*. Cap. 5. and *Cyp. Lib. de Lapſis*. 3. in the Manner frequently uſed of Adminiſtring the *Sacrament* to the *Sick*. Euſ. L. 6. Hiſt. C. 44. pag. 246. St *Ambroſe* himſelf received it in that Manner when he was upon the Point of Death, as is recorded in the Hiſtory of his Life.

From theſe undeniable Inſtances of *Communions* in *one Kind* practiſed in the *primitive Church* I infer it was her Judgment, 1. That *Communion* in *one Kind* is not forbid by *Chriſt*, whoſe Laws cannot be violated upon any Pretence whatſoever. 2. That the *Sacrament* is not *mutilated* by it; for then it would be *Sacrilege* to receive it in *one Kind*, which the *Primitive Church* would not have ſuffer'd. 3. That neither the *Teſtament* of *Chriſt* is *violated*, nor the Faithful deprived of any Part of our Saviour's *Legacy*; both which are *Impieties*, which the *primitive Church* would have abhor'd. Whence I conclude again, that Receiving in *one* or *both Kinds* was regarded by the *primitive Church* as a Point of *Diſcipline* only; which therefore the *Church* has full Authority to change at any Time for juſt Reaſons.

Now, if you desire to know the Reasons, that induced the *Church* to forbid the *Cup* to the *Laity*, you may find them in the *Catechism ad Parochos de Euch. Sacram.* Sect. 70. But the chief was to prevent even casual and involuntary *Prophanations* by Spilling any *Drops* of the *consecrated* Wine: which was almost unavoidable in a great Croud of Communicants.

G. My Lord, I leave it to yourself, whether « the Reasons in that *Catechism* be not *Childish*: or « are of Weight to *maim* the *Institution* of *Christ*. « pag. 172. «

L. Sr, your groundless Clamour about our *Maiming* the *Institution* of *Christ* deserves that Compliment much better, as I have sufficiently shew'd. But the Reasons given by the *Catechism* can only appear Childish to those, who either believe not a Word of *the Body and Blood of Christ being received verily and indeed in the Sacrament*; or tho they do believe it have Consciences of so large a Size, as not be much concern'd about *Prophanations*.

One of the Reasons given by the *Catechism* for Taking away the Cup is because some Constitutions can neither endure the smell nor Tast of Wine. This I presume you take to be a very *Childish* one. But the *French Protestants* did not think it so. For in their Synod at *Poitiers* An. 1560. they decreed [Ch. 13. Art. 7. of the *Lord's Supper*] *that the Bread of our Lord's Supper ought to be administer'd to those, who cannot drink Wine.* This I think is a good *Protestant Testimony*, that Receiving the Communion in *one Kind* is neither *Sacrilege*, nor *Mangling* the *Sacrament*, nor a *Violation* of any *Divine Precept*. For if it were, no Necessity could excuse it; and they who could not receive *both Kinds*, would be obliged to receive neither the *one* nor the *other*.

» *G.* 'Tis certain, My Lord, there muſt be no » Compariſon made betwixt the *Body* and *Blood* of » *Chriſt* as to Preference, or which is moſt valua- » ble. But our *Redemption* is oftner attributed in » holy Scripture to his *Blood* than to his *Body*. *We* » *are ſaved by the Blood ..... Propitiation through his* » *Blood ..... By the Sprinkling of his Blood ..... &c.* » pag. 172. 173.

L. Here again, Sr, who will not imagine you believe as firmly as any *Papiſt* in the World, that the *Body and Blood of Chriſt* are really and truly preſent in the *Sacrament*? For we muſt either ſuppoſe this to be your Belief, or that you are the greateſt Diſſembler imaginable of your Faith. Either therefore you believe the *Body and Blood of Chriſt* to be preſent in the *Sacrament*, or you do not. If not, all you ſay now is rank Diſſimulation and Hypocriſy; ſince you both ſpeak of it and argue from it as if you did. But if you do believe it, you muſt renounce common Senſe to ſay we can receive the *living Body of Chriſt* without receiving his *Blood*: and if his *living Body* cannot be received without his *Blood* (as ſurely it cannot) what can be more impertinently quoted than the aboveſaid three Texts, even tho they had a Reference to the *Euchariſt*? Whereas they are manifeſtly ſpoken of the *Blood* of *Chriſt* as ſhed upon the *Croſs* for our *Redemption*. But his Attributing *Life everlaſting*, that is, the whole Fruit of the Sacrament to *Eating* alone *Joh.* 6. ℣. 58. comes I think ſomewhat cloſer up to the Purpoſe.

§. 41.

Some ſophiſtical Remarks upon the 6th of St John *anſwer'd.*

G. MY Lord, we take not this as ſpoke of « the *Sacrament*, but of *Faith* in *Chriſt* here « expreſs'd by *Eating*; that is ſpiritually, as himſelf « explains it ℣. 63. *it is the Spirit that quickneth, the* « *Flesh profiteth nothing. The Words that I ſpeak unto you,* « *they are Spirit, and they are Life.* pag. 173. «

L. Sr, I have fully explain'd the true Meaning of this Text in our Diſpute concerning *Tranſubſtantiation* (§. 25.) ſo if you have any Thing more to ſay, I am ready to give you full Satisfaction.

G. But let us now ſuppoſe, thoſe Words, *if* « *any Man eat this Bread he ſhall live for ever.* And, « *the Bread I will give is my Flesh, which I will give* « *for the Life of the World.* Let us, I ſay, ſuppoſe « them to be underſtood of the *Sacrament* as you « do, you will find the *Blood* join'd with the *Flesh* in « the next Words. ℣. 54. *Except you eat the Flesh of* « *the Son of Man, and drink his Blood* ---- as before « quoted. And again, ℣. 55. *Whoſo eateth my Flesh* « *and drinketh my Blood* ---- and ℣. 56. *For my Flesh* « *is Meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed.* and « ℣. 52. *he that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood.* « Is not the *Blood* here named with the *Flesh?* But « if it were not, there are a hundred Places, as I « now obſerved, where the *Blood of Chriſt* is named « as *cleanſing*, as *Redeeming* us, &c. without any men- « tion of his *Flesh* or *Body.* Are they therefore *exclu-* « *ded?* This is ſuch a Sort of Reaſoning, as if I invite « you to eat with me you muſt have no Drink to your « Dinner, becauſe it is not named. *pag.* 173. 174. «

L. Pray, Sr, what *Catholick Divine* in the World ever ſaid, that when the *Flesh* or *Body* of Chriſt is mention'd alone in holy Scripture, his *Blood* is *excluded?* Or that it is not neceſſary to receive his *Blood* as well as *Body?* On the contrary we maintain expreſsly, that Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood* are wholly inſeparable; whence we conclude, that his *Body* cannot poſſibly be received without his *Blood*, nor his *Blood* without his *Body*; and that, by Conſequence, *whole Chriſt* is always received whether by a Communion in *one* or *both Kinds:* ſo far are we from excluding the Neceſſity or Obligation of Receiving his *Blood*. So pray, Sr, leave off Beating the Air, and Fighting againſt your own Shadow.

As to your pleaſant Parity of *inviting me to eat with you, and giving me no Drink to my Dinner, if you do not expreſsly name it*; I aſſure you, Sr, I ſhall take it very ill to be ſo uſed: unleſs you can contrive Matters ſo, that Eating alone ſhall be equivalent both to *Eating* and *Drinking*; which is the Caſe in the *Lord's Supper*; where our *Spiritual Meat* and *Drink*, that is, the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt are inſeparable, as I have fully proved. So that whoever eats his *Body*, by the ſame Action receives his ſacred *Blood* into his Stomach. And ſo I hope that when I come to eat with you, you will not refuſe me Drink by Way of Argumentation.

» *G.* But, My Lord, if by Eating we commonly » mean the *whole Meal*, and *Drinking* is likewiſe in- » cluded, the Criticiſm upon the *Lord's Supper* will » appear what it is, and not be thought ſufficient to » exclude the *Cup* in the *Sacrament*, and you have » no other Foundation in Scripture. *pag.* 174.

L. Sr, I grant that by *Eating* is commonly meant the *whole Meal*, and that *Drinking* is likewiſe included if we ſpeak of ordinary Meals, becauſe in theſe

the Action of *Eating* or *Drinking* alone cannot convey both *Meat* and *Drink* into our Stomachs. But the Caſe is quite otherwiſe in the *Lord's Supper*; where, as I told you juſt now, our *ſpiritual Meat and Drink*, that is, the *Body and Blood of Chriſt* being inſeparable are convey'd into our Stomachs either by the Action of *Eating* or *Drinking* alone. And this is no *Criticiſm*, but a ſolid Truth; unleſs you will maintain this impious Abſurdity, that we receive *one Half* of Chriſt by *Eating*, and the *other Half* by *Drinking*.

This therefore ſuffices to juſtify *Communion in one Kind*. Becauſe whoever receives the *whole Body and Blood of Chriſt* cannot ſurely be ſaid to be defrauded of any Part of the *ſpiritual Meal*, he has ordain'd for us.

But ſince you tell me, we have no other Foundation in Scripture, but what I have inſiſted upon from the 6th Chapter of St *John* (tho that might ſuffice) I think St *Paul* has laid a very ſolid Foundation both of our *Doctrine* and *Diſcipline* in the two following Texts. *Firſt*, that *Chriſt being raiſed from the Dead dieth no more*. Rom. 6. ℣. 9. And *2dly*, that *whoſoever ſhall eat this Bread*, OR *drink this Cup unworthily*, *ſhall be guilty of the Body and Blood of our Lord*. 1. Cor. C. 11. ℣. 27. Whence (beſides a clear *innuendo*, that the primitive Chriſtians did ſometimes either only *eat* the *Bread*, or only *drink* the *Cup*) it follows plainly, that as either *Eating* OR *Drinking* unworthily ſuffices to render us guilty both of the *Body and Blood of our Lord*, ſo either *Eating* OR *Drinking* worthily ſuffices to render us Partakers both of his *Body and Blood*.

I know your Tranſlators have boldly falſified this Text of St *Paul* by changing OR into AND, to avoid the force of this Argument: and there is not a lear-

ned Man amongſt you but knows it. Yet it ſtands to this Day uncorrected in your Bibles. So tender is your Church of the Purity of God's Words.

» *G.* But, My Lord, if I once call it *Eating* the » *Lord's Supper*, and ſeveral Times call it both *Ea-* » *ting* and *Drinking*, will not the latter explain the » Former? Or will *Eating* exclude *Drinking*, tho » *Drinking* be expreſſly named? To *eat* the *Lord's* » *Supper* is the only Phraſe we uſe, I never heard » any Body call it *Drinking* the *Lord's Supper*. And » you may thence prove that we have not the *Cup* » in our *Sacrament* as well as that the Apoſtles had » it not; becauſe it is ſaid, they *eat Bread*, and » *broke Bread*. But I have overlabour'd this Point, » becauſe you lay ſo much Streſs upon it. *pag.* » 174.

L. You have indeed overlabour'd it, and ſhew'd yourſelf a moſt skilful Puzzle-Cauſe in darkning and perplexing the cleareſt Truth. You ask, *if it be once call'd Eating the Lord's Supper, and ſeveral Times both Eating and Drinking, whether the latter do's not explain the former?* I anſwer the latter do's ſo far explain the former as to render it manifeſt, that no Man *eats* the *Lord's Supper*, unleſs he receives both his *Body* and *Blood* into his Stomach. But ſince I have demonſtrated that this is done either by *Eating* or *Drinking only*, a man muſt renounce common Senſe to pretend, that the external Form both of *Eating* and *Drinking* is neceſſary.

You ask again, *whether Eating do's exclude Drinking, tho Drinking be expreſſly named?* I anſwer it do's not; if by *Drinking* be meant, *receiving the Blood of Chriſt*. Becauſe his *Body* and *Blood* being inſeparable, we cannot *eat* his *Body* without receiving his *Blood*. But if you mean no more than the *external Form of Drinking*, it is neither *excluded* by the Texts which

mention *Eating alone*, nor *commanded* by the Texts, which mention *them both*. But our Saviour's Attributing the whole Virtue and Efficacy of the Sacrament ſometimes to *Eating alone*, other Times to *Eating and Drinking join'd together* ſhews very plainly that it is not the *external Form*, or Manner of Receiving under *One* or *both Kinds*, but the *Thing received*, which beſtows Grace and Life everlaſting on the worthy Receiver.

Finally, you tell me, you never call it otherwiſe than *Eating the Lord's Supper*, and *that I may prove thence that you have not the Cup in the Sacrament as well as that the Apoſtles had it not, becauſe it is ſaid, they eat Bread, and broke Bread.* But pray Sr, when did I prove from *thoſe Words*, that the *Apoſtles* had not the *Cup?* I never ſaid any ſuch Thing, and ſo you ought not to charge we with it. I have indeed drawn an Argument from the 6th Chapter of St *John*, where our Saviour attributes the whole Virtue of the Sacrament to *Eating alone*, as well as to *Eating and Drinking*. But can I therefore pretend to prove, that you have not the *Cup* in the Sacrament, becauſe you call it *Eating the Lord's Supper?* No, Sr, I am not diſpoſed to trifle thus with Words; becauſe I know your Meaning both from your Principles, and conſtant Practice: Whereas I find the very Reverſe of thoſe Principles in the *Word of God*. I find St *Paul* telling the Romans, *that Chriſt being raiſed from the Dead dieth no more. 6. ℣. 9.* the Conſequence whereof is, that his *Body* and *Blood* are now inſeparable; and this is the very Foundation of the Doctrine of *Concomitancy*. Whence it follows, that *Communion in one Kind* cannot be a *mangled Sacrament*, as you pretend. I find the ſame Apoſtle telling the *Corinthians*, that *whoſoever ſhall eat the Bread, or drink the Cup unworthily, ſhall be guilty of*

the Body AND *Blood of our Lord.* 1. Cor. 11. ℣. 27. Now, if *either* Eating *Or* Drinking unworthily ſuffices to render us *guilty both of the Body and Blood of our Lord*, 'tis manifeſt that *either* eating *or* Drinking worthily ſuffices to render us *Partakers* both of his *Body and Blood.* From theſe two Principles clearly deliver'd in holy Writ we may legally infer, that our Saviour's often Attributing the whole Virtue and Efficacy of the Sacrament to *Eating alone* is a ſolid Proof, that when he mentions *both Eating and Drinking* it is not meant as a Precept to oblige all to receive the Sacrament *in both Kinds*, but only to receive his *Body and Blood*, which is done by a Communion *in one Kind* as well as *both*: as I have fully demonſtrated to any Man, who believes the *Body and Blood* of Chriſt to be really and truly preſent in the *Sacrament.*

But who are the Perſons appointed by *Chriſt* to be the *Interpreters* of his ſacred Word? *He that heareth you* (ſays *Chriſt*) *heareth me, and he that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me.* Luke 10. ℣. 16. Again, who are the Perſons commiſſion'd by him to *feed* and *govern* his Flock, and preſcribe the proper Methods of *Adminiſtring* the *Sacraments?* St *Paul* reſolves the Queſtion in theſe few Words. *Let a Man ſo account of us as of the Miniſters of Chriſt, and the Stewards of the Myſteries of God.* 1. Cor. 4. ℣. 1. From which two *Texts* it is plain, that the *Biſhops* and *Paſtors* of the *Church*, who are the *Succeſſors* of the *Apoſtles*, and to whom *Chriſt* has promiſed his *perpetual Aſſiſtance*, are the only Perſons authoriz'd by him to *interpret* the *Word* of *God*, and regulate the Manner of *Diſpenſing* the Sacred *Myſteries* to the People. And was it not then a moſt inſolent Madneſs (for St *Auſtin* ſpeaking of a parallel Caſe gives it no ſofter Name) in a few private Perſons to pretend to underſtand

Scriptures better, than all the *Bishops* and *Paſtors* of *God's Church* had done for fifteen Ages together, and preſcribe Laws for the *Adminiſtration* of *Sacraments* in Oppoſition to all *Eccleſiaſtical Authority* upon Earth?

If there were any *poſitive Command* Obliging *all* to receive *both Kinds*, is it probable the *Univerſal Church* could have been ſo blind as not to ſee it? And if they ſaw it, what Motive could her *Bishops* and *Paſtors* have to combine together in a Reſolution to commit a damnable Sin by *Forbidding* what *Chriſt* had *commanded*, when there was neither *Honour*, *Intereſt*, nor *Pleaſure*, nor any viſible human Motive to induce them to it? Tis certain therefore that when they took the *Cup* from the *Laity*, that is, when they made that a *Law*, which had been the general Practice long before, they were convinced in their Hearts of two Things. 1. That the People were not injured by it, and 2*ly*, that there was no *Command*, that obliged them to receive it. And if neither they, nor the *great Lights* of the *Primitive Church* could ever diſcover any *ſuch Command*, it looks like a *Chimera* rather than a *Probability*, that a Set of obſcure factious Perſons without *Miſſion* or *Authority* from any *lawful Superiour* ſhould be more intelligent and clearſighted in *Divine Matters* than they, and ſee Things wholly unſeen before. Truly, Sr, if *Bedlam* ſhould ſet up for a *School of Learning*, *Children* for *Maſters* to their *Teachers*, and the *Blind* for *Guides* to their *Leaders*, the Thing would be as little Surprizing in itſelf as the *Preſumption* and *Arrogance* of any Set of Men pretending to be *Wiſer* than the *Univerſal Church*. This alone ſuffices to ſtop the Mouth of any pretended *Reformer*, who is not loſt to all Senſe of *Modeſty*, as *Luther* certainly was, when he made this Declaration, *that if a Council*

ſhould either appoint or permit Communion in both Kinds, he would in Spite of that Council either receive it in one Kind, or in neither. Hiſt. de Variat. C. 2. §. 10. This was Speaking like a *true Reformer.* But enough of this: ſo I deſire you to proceed to ſome other Matter.

§. 42.

Of Celibacy, *or the* Single Life *of* Prieſts.

» *G.* I Shall now ſhew you another Reſtriction, » your *Church* has made upon the *Inſtitutions* » of *God.* As ſhe has taken the *Cup* from the *Laity*, » ſo ſhe has taken another of your *Sacraments*, that » is, *Marriage* from the *Clergy.* pag. 174.

L. I perceive, St, you are now Going to fight *pro Aris & Focis.* And me thinks I ſee a formidable Army of all the *Biſhops* and *Parſons Wives* and *Children* in *Great Britain* drawn up in Battle againſt me. But I comfort myſelf, that I have St *Paul* of my Side, who never *begot Children* (for ought I ever heard of) *but in Jeſus-Chriſt through the Goſpel.* 1. Cor. 4. ℣. 15. Nay I have the Practice of the *whole College* of *Apoſtles* for me. I mean not the *Apoſtles* of the *Reformation*, but the *Apoſtles* of *Jeſus-Chriſt*, if St *Jerom* may be believed, who tell us Epiſt. 50. *that they were either unmarried, or had no Commerce with their Wives:* Meaning, after they were call'd to the *Miniſtry* of the *Goſpel.*

But leaſt I ſhould be guilty of giving any Diſquiet to that Part of the fair Sex, who think themſelves married to *true Biſhops* and *Prieſts*, I aſſure them they may continue with a ſafe Conſcience to live with their Husbands: At leaſt they need to have no ſcruple about it, till their Husbands can prove the *Validity* of their *Ordination* as fully as we can prove

prove that Persons *validly ordain'd* cannot *marry* according to the *Ancient Laws* of the *Church.*

G. I perceive then your *Lordship* do's us the Favour to think, our *married Bishops* and *Parsons* live not in a State of *Adultery.*

L. Sr, I should wrong them very much, if I thought they did. For I see no Manner of Reason why *Protestant Bishops* and *Parsons* may not marry as well as the *Protestant* Laity. So that whatever I say concerning the *Celibacy* or *single Life* of *Bishops* and *Priests* is no Reflection upon *your Church* as now establish'd, but only a Vindication of my own. And I think I may modestly say I plead the more honourable Cause of the two. For *Virginity* is commendable even in *Laymen.* The *ancient Fathers* have writ whole Volumes in Commendation of it, and St *Paul* recommends it preferably to *Marriage.* 1. Cor. 7. ℣. 32. 33. 38. Nay he advises even Married Persons to abstain from the conjugal Duty for a Time, *that they may give themselves* (says he) *to Prayer.* 1. Cor. 7. ℣. 5. Upon which Words St *Jerom* writes thus against *Jovinian* Lib. 1. C. 19. *If a Layman* (says he) *cannot pray without Abstaining sometimes from the Conjugal Duty, a Priest who must always offer Sacrifice, must always pray: and if he must always pray, he must always be unmarried.*

This *Jovinian* (whom St *Jerom* stiles the *Christian Epicure*) was the *Martin Luther* of his Time in openly Opposing the *Lawfulness* of *Religious Vows*, and the *Celibacy* of *Priests:* And, if the World had then been ripe for a *Godly Reformation*, he would have saved *Luther* some Part of his Trouble. But the *Church* was then too *Popishly* affected to suffer him to prevail. For he no sooner appear'd upon the Stage but was excommunicated, and his *Heresy* condemn'd *first* by a *Council* at *Rome* under Pope *Siricius.* St *Ambr.*

Epiſt. 6. and afterwards by a *Council* at *Milan*. Epiſt. 7. and by the Writings of St *Ambroſe* St *Jerom* and St *Auſtin*, who exhorted as many as they could both Men and Women to conſecrate themſelves to God by *Religious Vows*, tho *Jovinian* urged the ſame *Texts* of *Scripture* againſt it as are now commonly made Uſe of by *Proteſtants*. But becauſe he ſeduced ſome ignorant Virgins by Saying, *are you better than Abraham Sara &c.* St *Auſtin* bid them anſwer, *I am not better than Abraham, but the Chaſtity of a ſingle Life is better than the Chaſtity of Marriage*. Lib. de bono Conjug. C. 28. How different was the *Spirit* of thoſe *eminent Lights* of the *Church* from that of our late *Reformers*.

Now St *Paul's* Recommending a *Single Life* as the *perfecter State* even to *Laymen* was doubtleſs the principal Motive that induced the *Church* to prohibit the *Marriage* of *Prieſts*. For, as their *Prieſtly Character* obliges them to a *greater Perfection* than that of *Laymen*, it is but reaſonable they ſhould embrace the *perfecter State*. And ſince the Duties of the *married State* are look'd upon by the ſame *Apoſtle* as a *Hindrance* to *Prayer*, they whoſe Office it is to aſſiſt at the Altar and pray not only for themſelves but the People alſo, ſeem to be call'd and deſtined by God to no other *Marriage* than that of the *Lamb*. Nothing certainly appears more congruous in itſelf than that a Perſon, whoſe *Functions* are wholly *Spiritual*, and whoſe Time ought to be divided between the Duties of *Study* and *Prayer* and the *Care* of *Souls*, ſhould be free from the Concern of *Wife* and *Children*, and not imbark'd in all the *Solicitudes* of this Life like Wordly Perſons.

This then is the *firſt Rule*, on which I ground my Juſtification of the *Church's Diſcipline* relating to the *Celibacy* of *Prieſts*: viz. *becauſe a ſingle Life is of itſelf*

a more perfect State, and more becoming the Clergy than the Conjugal State.

The ſecond Rule is, that tho many *married Perſons* were in the *Primitive Ages* admitted or rather *compell'd* to *holy Orders* in Conſideration of their Extraordinary Merits, yet none were allow'd to marry *after* their Ordination. The *Council* of *Nice* affords us a Proof of this Truth. For that Council intending to make a Decree to ſeparate even *ſuch Biſhops Prieſts* and *Deacons* from their *Wives* as had been married *before* their Ordination, was indeed diſſuaded from it by St *Paphnucius*: yet it decreed that *ſuch as came unmarried into the Clergy, ſhould always remain ſingle according to the ancient Tradition of the Church.* Socrates Lib. 1. Hiſt. C. 8. *illud ſatis eſſe, ut qui in Clerum ante adſcripti erant quam duxiſſent uxores, hi ſecundum veterem Eccleſiæ Traditionem deinceps à Nuptiis abſtinerent.*

'Tis plain then that according to the *ancient Diſcipline* of the *Church* none were allow'd to marry after their Admiſſion to *holy Orders* even in the *Eaſtern* Church, and as to the Diſcipline of the *weſtern* Church St *Jerom* writes thus. *Biſhops Prieſts and Deacons are either choſen Virgins or Widowers; or at leaſt abſtain after Prieſthood from the Uſe of Marriage as long as they live.* Epiſ. 50.

This then is the *ſecond Rule* I go by. *viz.* that *according to the ancient Diſcipline of the Church none were permitted to marry after they were once engaged in holy Orders.*

The third Rule is, *that all Vows freely made to God are binding.* This none but *Atheiſts* can deny, becauſe *God* himſelf has declared it. *When thou ſhalt vow a Vow unto the Lord thy God, thou ſhalt not ſtack to pay it ----- that which is gone out of thy Lips thou ſhalt keep and perform.* Deut. 23. ℣. 21. 23. And St

Paul says of *Widows* consecrated to *God*, that *when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ they will marry having Damnation because they have cast off their first Faith.* 1. Tim. 5. ℣. 11. 12.

The *fourth* and last Rule is, *that the single Life of Bishops and Priests is a Matter of Ecclesiastical Government or Discipline only.* Whence I infer *first*, that the *Church* had always *full Authority* to make it a *Law*; especially in Regard of those who freely offer themselves to holy Orders. For, if they be not disposed to perform the *Conditions* upon which they are received, they ought not to engage themselves. I infer *2dly*, that tho the *Primitive Church* had made no such *Law*, the *Church* might lawfully have done it in *After-Ages* at least in Reference to such, as were not already engaged. Because the *Church of Christ* has always the *same Authority*; nor is there any Reason why she should lose any Part of it by *Time* or *Age*. Now Sr, you may put what Objections you please.

§. 43.

Objections answer'd.

G. MY Lord, I pass by the politick Views and Advantages the *Court of Rome* has in this, as giving the Pope the more absolute Command, and making him in Effect Heir of all the great Possessions of the Clergy. For the *Canon-law* obliges the *regular Bishops* not to dispose of their Estates, and the other Clergy not to be too liberal of their Almes in their Sickness. And what they leave the Pope disposes of as grand Treasurer of the Church. *pag.* 173. 174.

L. Sr, I never heard the Pope was *Heir* to the

hereditary Estates either of Bishops or Priests. And as to their Benefices or Ecclesiastical Revenues, they pass of Course to the next incumbents; and they may dispose of their ready Cash as they Judge fitting during their Lives, without being accountable for it to any but God alone. So that it is beyond my Comprehension how the *Celibacy* of Bishops and Priests should make the Pope in Effect Heir of all the great Possessions of the Clergy, as you are pleased to tell me.

G. My Lord, I am content to wave this Argu- « ment, and will only insist upon what relates to « Conscience. *pag.* 175. «

L. Very well, Sr.

G. You reckon it a Defilement in your Church « for a *Clergyman* to marry. No great Compliment to « the married State, which yet was instituted by God « in *Paradise*, whilst Man was in his innocence. *pag.* « 175. «

L. Sr, we reckon it a Defilement in a Priest to be false to a solemn Engagement made to God; and so do's St *Paul* reckon it one even in the *Laity*. 1. Tim. 5. ℣. 11. 12. And I hope all true Christians are of the same Mind. Nor do I think a Man is bound by any Institution, tho made in the State of Innocence, to commit a *Sacrilege* out of a Compliment to the *married State*.

G. The Apostle says, *Marriage is honourable in* « *all, and the Bed undefiled*. Heb. 13. ℣. 4. *pag.* 175. «

L. But *Sacrilege* is not honourable in any; nor is a *sacrilegious Bed undefiled* tho colour'd over with the Name of Marriage. The incestuous Marriage of the *Corinthian* whom St *Paul* deliver'd up to Satan 1. *Cor.* 5. ℣. 5. was not very honourable. Nor the Marriage of *Widows* who *began to wax Wanton a-gainst Christ*. And *Luther's* Marriage with a *Nun* was

just as honourable as any of These. Lastly, tho *Marriage be honourable* according to St *Paul*, the State of *Celibacy* is still more honourable according to the same Apostle; and the more honourable State is surely best becoming the honourable Character of Bishops and Priests; otherwise St *Paul* would not have made Choice of it for himself.

» *G.* But *Forbidding to marry* is *reckon'd one of the* » *Doctrines of the Devil.* 1. Tim. 4. ℣. 3. *pag.* 175.

L. Forbidding to marry as a Thing unlawful in itself (as the *Manichees* and *Marcionites* did) is *the Doctrine of Devils.* But forbidding particular Persons (who have voluntarily consecrated themselves to God) to marry is not the Doctrine of *Devils* but the Doctrine of St *Paul* in the very next Chapter, where he tells *Widows* consecrated to God, that if they marry they gain *Damnation* to themselves. Besides I never heard the *Devil* was the Author of forbidding Marriages within the *prohibited Degrees*; in which your Church is as much concern'd as ours.

» *G.* My Lord, Directions are given by St *Paul* » how a *Bishop* should govern his *Wife* and *Children.* » For *if a Man knows not how to rule his own House,* » *how shall he take Care of the House of God?* 1. Tim. » C. 3. ℣. 5. Yet your Interpreters would have this » *Wife* and this *House* to be the Church. *pag.* 175.

L. Sr, St *Paul's* Words are clear enough to be their own Interpreters. For they can mean nothing else than that a Person, who suffers or countenances Disorders in his own private Family, is not fit to govern the *Church* of *Christ.*

However, tho in the Chapter you have quoted I find Directions both how a *Bishop* is to govern his *Children* and *Deacons* their *Wives*, yet I do not find the *Directions* you speak of, *viz.* how a *Bishop*,

should govern his *Wife*: which seems to be an insinuation that the Bishops then chosen, tho they were actually married, lived separated from their Wives.

'Tis true St *Paul* tells us in the 2d Verse of the same Chapter, that *a Bishop must be the Husband of one Wife*; the Meaning whereof cannot surely be that St *Paul* obliged Bishops to be married; for then he was bound to follow his own Rule; but that no Man was fit to be a Bishop who had been married oftner than *once*. And the Reason which induced the Apostle to prescribe that Rule in the Choice of *Deacons* as well as *Bishops* was, because tho in his Time Virginity was so rare both amongst *Jews* and *Gentiles*, that if neither married Men nor Widowers had been promoted to holy Orders, the Church would have been destitute of necessary Pastors, yet even then he would not have those taken to the Altar who had been *married twice*; because they appear'd to have stronger Ties to the earth, than were suitable to so holy an Employment.

G. My Lord, St *Peter* was a married Man and « forsook not his *Wife* after he was an Apostle, « but led her about with him as other Apostles did. « 1. Cor. 9. ℣. 5. *pag.* 175. «

L. Sr, this Description of the *Apostles* trailing about their *Wives* and conversing with them as such, appears to me so dishonourable to their sacred Character and unsuitable to their Apostolick Functions, that I wonder how any sober thinking Man can give into it. Did not St *Peter* say to Christ, *behold we have forsaken all and follow'd thee?* Math. 19. ℣. 27. And were not their *Wives* a Part of the *All* they had forsaken?

G. But do's not St *Paul* say expressly, *have we not Power to lead about a Sister a Wife as well as the other*

Apoſtles, and as the Brethren of the Lord and Cephas. 1. Cor. 9. V. 5.

L. Sr, the *Engliſh Proteſtant Bible* ſays ſo but not St *Paul*, who declaring himſelf to be *unmarried* Chapter 7th. V. 8. could not pretend to lead about a *Wife* Chapter the 9th. Neither did St *Peter* nor the other Apoſtles lead their Wives about, ſince St *Jerom* Epiſt. 50. declares poſitively, that the Apoſtles who were married lived ſeparated from their Wives. And writing againſt *Jovinian* who quoted that very Text of St *Paul*, tells him it ought to be tranſlated, *have we not Power to lead about a Siſter a Woman? &c.* meaning ſome ancient Matrone or *Diatoniſſa* as attended St *Peter* and other Apoſtles in their Travels, and provided Neceſſaries for them either out of their own ſubſiſtence or the Alms of the Faithful. Nay I perceive your own Church begins to have ſome Diffidence of their Tranſlation. For in the late Edition of the Bible in two large *Folios* at *Oxford*, tho *Wife* be kept in the Text, *Woman* is put in the Margin. Which is at leaſt one Step towards an Acknowledgment of the Truth; and I pray God to improve it.

» *G.* My Lord, that in the primitive Church the » Clergy did marry is plain from *Socrates*. Hiſt. Eccleſ. L. 1. C. 11. and L. 5. C. 22. *pag.* 175.

L. Sr, it is plain not only from *Socrates* but all Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians that many of the primitive Bishops and Prieſts were married Men. But it is no leſs plain from *Socrates*, as I have shew'd before, that the *Council* of *Nice* made a Decree to prohibit any Bishop or Prieſt to marry after his Ordination.

» *G.* My Lord, the Vows of ſingle Life were not » impoſed upon the Clergy till Pope *Hildebrand*. » See *Math. Weſtm.* ad An. 1074, *Vincent. Spec. Hiſt.* » L. 24. C. 45. *Antoninus* L. 16. C. 1. §. 21. *And it was*

without

without Precedent (says *Sigibert Chron.* ad An. 1074.) " *and, as many thought, out of an indiscreet Zeal contrary* " *to the Opinion of the holy Fathers.* But *Hildebrand* was " not obey'd in this in *England* for above a hun- " dred Years after. For our ancient Records say " (*Hist. Petroburg.* An. 1127. apud *Spelman*) *all these* " *Decrees avail'd nothing. For the Priests by the King's* " *Consent had still their Wives as formerly*, pag. 176. "

L. Sr, it is not at all material, whether Pope *Hildebrand* was or was not the first that imposed *Vows* of a single Life upon the Clergy. For such a Vow could only inforce the Obligation they were already under by the ancient *Canons* of the Church, which had never been repeal'd; and so it obliged them to nothing, but what they were obliged to before. Just as if a Vow to keep the *Fast* of *Lent* were now imposed upon *Roman Catholicks*, no Man could legally infer from it, that it was therefore a new Thing, or a Duty they were not strictly obliged to comply with independently of such a Vow. All therefore we can gather from that Fact and the other related by *Spelman* (if it be litterally true, which may be question'd) all, I say, we can gather from it is, that in the 11th and 12th Century great irregularities were practised by many of the inferiour Clergy, who kept their *Concubines*, and call'd them *Wives*, but were no more so, than *Kate Boren* was the lawful Wife of *Martin Luther*. And to shew they were regarded by the Church no otherwise than as *Concubines*, besides many other Synodal Decrees against them in other Places, there was a *general Synod* held at *London* by the Pope's Legate in the very Year mention'd by *Spelman*, in which *several Canons were made for the Reformation and Celibacy of the Clergy*, says Mr *Echard* in his *History of England*, L. 2. C. 1. *pag.* 174. But the same Author adds, *that they*

were not much regarded (as the very Laws of God are but little regarded by Libertines) *till some few Years after An.* 1129. *the King desirous to settle the Celibacy of the Clergy in a Synod call'd on Purpose: through the Weakness of the Archbishop* (as Mathew Paris *expresses it*) *obtain'd Power to have the sole Execution of this Law himself: but instead of Restraining the pretended Abuse, he punish'd them in their Purses, and receiving Sums from a great many of them he permitted them to enjoy their Wives as formerly.*

Now this Relation of Mr *Echard* gives a very different turn to the whole Matter from that of *Spelman*. For what he calls *the King's Consent*, is here fairly represented as a bare *Connivance*, into which the King was brided by large Sums of Money: and the severe Laws made by the two Synods, Mr *Echard* speaks of, against those of the Clergy who kept *Concubines* tho they call'd them *Wives*, is a Proof, that the Bishops assembled in those Synods regarded it as a sinful Abuse, which stood highly in Need of a Reformation: and in Effect they who practised it were always branded with the infamous Name of *Concubinarians*, which is but a softer Word for what we call in plain *English*, Whoremasters.

» *G.* My Lord, *Gregory the Great* said, *that it was* » *lawful for such of the Clergy, as could not contain, to* » *marry.* (Resp. ad Interrog. 2m. Aug. Cant.) and » *Pius II.* said the same, *that they may be allow'd to* » *marry.* Platina. *pag.* 176.

L. Sr, I must here accuse you of very foul Dealing in both these Quotations. As to Pope *Gregory*, you have falsified him by Stifling that Part of his Words, which fully explain his meaning. They are these. *If there be any of the Clergy,* WHO ARE NOT IN HOLY ORDERS, *and cannot contain, they ought to marry.* Now there are great Numbers in our Clet-

gy, who are neither *Priests*, *Deacons*, nor *Subdeacons*, but only in *lesser Orders*; who therefore are free to return to the World and marry. And so St *Gregory's* Words instead of Allowing the Marriage either of *Priests*, *Deacons*, or *Subdeacons*, who are all in *holy Orders*, imply a Prohibition of it according to this Maxim, *exceptio confirmat legem*: because it would be meer Trifling to limit a Law, that is not in Force.

As to the Words of *Pius II.* (for which you quote *Platina* in his Life) they seem to import no less, than that Pope *Pius* being consulted as *Head of the Church*, whether *Priests that could not contain might marry*, had answer'd *ex Cathedra*, that *they might*: whereas I can find no such Thing. 'Tis true, *Platina* at the End of that Pope's Life entertains his Reader with many pleasant Sayings used by him in common Conversation, amongst which this is one, *That there was great Reason for the prohibiting of Priests to marry, but greater for allowing it again.* pag. 401. printed *London*, An. 1688. Now if the same Pope in a pleasant Mood had said, that *there was great Reason for Prohibiting the Plurality of Wives, but greater for Allowing it again*, it would have been full as good an Argument for *Poligamy*, as his other Saying is for the *Marriage of Priests*.

§. 44.

Other Objections answer'd.

G. MY Lord, your great Canonist *Panormitan* « Says, *there is as great Reason to allow Priests* « *to marry now as ever there was to restrain it.* Let St « *Bernard* bear Witness in his Time what Reason « there was for Allowing it. he says, *There are many* «

» who cannot be hid for their Multitude, nor do seek to » be conceal'd for their impudence, who being restrain'd » from the Nuptial Remedies, run into all Filthiness. » Bern. de conv. ad Cler. C. 29. And another says, » that few in those Days were free from Fornication: » Glos. ad Gratian. Dist. 82. C. 5. And *Mathew Pa-* » *ris* tells, that the Pope thought it almost a Miracle » that a Candidate for a Bishoprick was said to be » a pure Virgin. Whence the *Glos. ad Gratian*; in » the Place just before quoted calls *Fornication* but a » *venial Sin*; and it is tolerated, if not allow'd, ibid. » Dist. 34. C. 7. However it was reckon'd a less Sin » in a *Priest* than *Marriage*. For this Reason deadly » Sin is added to Fornication in our Litany. *p.* 176. » 177.

L. St. as to *Mathew Paris's* Tale of what a certain Pope *thought*, and *Gratian's* Saying, *that few were free from Fornication*; I wonder you can lay a Stress upon such trifling Stuff. But suppose the *Thought* of the one, and the *Saying* of the other deserved a serious Regard, all that can be gather'd from them, as likewise from the Words of *Panormitan* and St *Bernard* is, that in the Time they speak of, there was a great Looseness and Corruption amongst the *Clergy*. But do's it suffice to make a Law unreasonable, because there are many Transgressors against it? If so, I fear the *Decalogue* will be thought unreasonable too, since Millions transgress daily against it's sacred Laws. I own however there are Inconveniences either in allowing or prohibiting the Marriage of Priests. But of two Evils the lesser is to be chosen. And when our Church is convinced, that it is a lesser Evil to allow them to marry, I doubt not but she will change her *Discipline* in this as she has sometimes done in other Things.

But your Representing it to be the Doctrine of

our Church, that *Fornication is but a venial Sin*, nay *that it is tolerated, if not allow'd by us*, is rank Calumny. For tho there were such a ridiculous Gloss upon *Gratian* a Writer of no Authority amongst us (which however I cannot find, tho I have read over both the *Distinctions* you refer me to) it will not excuse your slanderous Suggestion, *that it is the Doctrine of our Church*. Nay I am sure you know this to be a Calumny as well as myself. Or if you pretend ignorance, pray examine our Catechisms, or Books of Instruction upon the 6th Commandement, and shew me one if you can, that calls *Fornication a venial Sin*, or says, *it is tolerated, if not allow'd*.

As to what you add, *that Fornication is reckon'd by our Church a less Sin in a Priest than Marriage*, you utterly mistake the Question in supposing, that our Priests may be truly and validly married, which we deny. For 'tis our Doctrine, that when a Priest pretends to marry, he only makes *Marriage* a Cloak to cover *habitual Sacrilege* and *Adultery*; which doubtless is more grievous, that a Sin casualy committed with a single Person.

This is the express Doctrine of *St Chrysostom*, who writes thus to one *Theodore* a fain Monk, that had married. *Marriage*, (says he) *is a just and lawful Thing. I grant it, but now it is not a Thing in your Power. For being once join'd to your heavenly Spouse, to leave him, and fall into the Embraces of a Wife, is Adultery. Give it a thousand Times if you please the Name of Marriage, I say it is as much Worse than Adultery, as God is better and greater than Mankind*, ad Theod. lapsum.

G. But why was *Celibacy* enjoin'd to Priests? *A.* And why is Marriage a greater Sin than *Fornication*? Because the first is a Breach of the Command

» of the *Church*; and the latter of the Command of » *God*. And the Difference of the Punishment of » theſe in your Church ſhews that she thinks ſo. » For a Prieſt committing *Fornication* comes off for » ſmall Penance, whereas if he *marries*, he is degra- » ded. May we not then ſay to the *Church of Rome*, » as Chriſt to the Church of the *Jews* in a parallel » Caſe, *full well ye reject the Commandement of God*, » *that ye may keep your own Tradition*. Mark. 7. ℣. 9. » pag. 177.

L. Sr, you may ſay to the *Church of Rome* what- ever you pleaſe. For who can debarr either you or any Body elſe the Privilege of Talking impertinent- ly? But when you ſpeak of the *ſmall Penance* impo- ſed for the Sin of *Fornication*, you either mean pri- vate or publick *Fornication*. If private only, I ſhould be glad to know, how you come to be inform'd of what paſſes in the *ſacred Tribunal* betwixt our Peni- tents and their Confeſſors. For I never heard of any Confeſſions in our Church cry'd about the Streets, as they are on every Execution-day in *London*. But if you ſpeak of *Fornication* publickly known, I aſ- ſure you Sr, the Party concern'd paſſes ſome Part of his Days very uncomfortably: and the ſmall Pe- nance you ſpeak of is uſualy a good long Confine- ment, where he is ſometimes regaled with Bread and Water; which I believe would not pleaſe a *Pro- teſtant* Stomach.

But you ask, *why Marriage is a greater Sin than Fornication?* Sr, true Marriage is no Sin at all, nor by Conſequence a Breach of God's Command. But in a Prieſt it is no more true Marriage, than it would be in a *Layman* to marry a *ſecond Wife*, his former being yet alive. Your Reaſon then why *Marriage* in a Prieſt is a greater Sin than *Fornication* is not on- ly falſe but malicious. For in a *Prieſt* they are both

against the *Church*, and both against *God*. But with this Difference, that the one may be the Effect of a passing Weakness; and the other cannot but be the Effect of an obstinate and premeditated Lust; which doubtless is more hainous in the Sight of God.

G. But, My Lord, if Marriage be such a Defilement, as is unworthy of a Priest, how came you to make a *Sacrament* of it? I suppose you cannot mean less by a *Sacrament* than a *Means of Grace*. You have made many less Things so, as I shew'd before. And would you deprive the Clergy of any Means of Grace? Or is it your Modesty to put them upon the Level with the Laity for depriving them of the *Cup* in the *Sacrament* of Christ's own *Institution?* pag. 177.

L. Sr, I shall answer you very briefly to every Point. *First*, you ask, *if Marriage be such a Defilement as is unworthy of a Priest, how we came to make it a Sacrament?* Sr, *Christ* made it a *Sacrament* not we. Nor is true Marriage a Defilement; but the single Life is perfecter, and more becoming a *Priest*. 2. You say, *you suppose we cannot mean less by a Sacrament than a means of Grace.* That's very true: but you add, *we have made many less Things so, as you have shew'd*: Both which are false, as I have shew'd. 3. You ask, *whether we would deprive the Clergy of any Means of Grace?* I answer, the *unmarried Clergy* stand no more in Need of the *Grace* annex'd to the *Sacrament* of *Marriage*, than the *married Laity* stand in Need of the *Grace* annex'd to the *Sacrament* of *Ordination*. Lastly you ask, *whether it be our Modesty to put the Clergy upon the Level with the Laity for depriving them of the Cup in the Sacrament of Christ's own Institution?* I answer, the Laity are deprived of no Part of the *Grace* or *Efficacy* of the *Sacraments* of

Christ's Body and Blood, and ſo your Queſtion is impertinent.

» *G. Marriage is honourable and undefiled in all*, » ſays the *Apoſtle*. No ſay you, it is *neither* in a » *Prieſt*. pag. 178.

L. And you ſay the very ſame of all ſuch, as are within the *prohibited Degrees*. Anſwer it if you can without limiting the Meaning of Saint *Paul's* Words.

» *G.* He ſays, *if men cannot contain let them mar-* » *ry, for it is better to marry than burn.* 1. Cor. 7. ℣. 9. » No, ſay you, it is better to *burn* than to *marry*. » And this you muſt ſay, unleſs you ſuppoſe that » all the many Thouſands of your Clergy, and » many of them young Men are every one of them » endow'd with the Gift of Continency, which would » be a miracle, if Experience did not contradict it. » *pag.* 178.

L. Sr, I do not pretend that in ſuch Numbers all are endow'd with the Gift of Continency: yet I am ſure all may be, and doubt not but the greateſt Part are with the Help of God's Grace. However I hope you are not of *Martin Luther's* Mind, whoſe admirable Doctrine it is, *that it is impoſſible either for* » *Man to live without a Woman, or for a Woman to live without a Man.* (Serm. de Matrim. Tom. 5. Fol. 11.) which me thinks is but a courſe Compliment to *Batchelors, Maids*, and *Widows*; of which there are many Thouſands even in *Great Britain*. Do all theſe then, or moſt of them live in a ſinful State? I have the Charity to think they do not: And if they do not, I hope the many Thouſands of *Prieſts* and *Religious* in our Church may be at leaſt as good as they.

G. But St *Paul* ſays, that *if Men cannot contain let them marry.* 1. Cor. 7. ℣. 9.

L. Pardo

L. Pardon me Sr, St *Paul* says no such Thing. His Text is falsified in your Bible, and ought to be render'd thus. *If they do not contain, let them marry:* which still is to be understood of those, who may legally embrace the State of Wedlock: for I don't find St *Paul* allow'd it to *Widows* consecrated to God. However there is a large Difference between *not Containing*, and *not being able* to contain. A Thief do's not contain from Stealing: but I hope he can contain from it if he pleases, tho his Fingers itch never so much to be at it. So an Adulterer do's not contain from Coveting his Neighbours Wife; but St *Paul* will not tell him that he *cannot* contain. For if he cannot contain, he cannot be blamed if he do's not contain: because *Necessity has no Law.*

G. I am sure at least St *Paul* says, *it is better to marry than Burn.*

L. Very right, Sr, and St *Paul* teaches nothing but truth. But he do's not say it is better to commit *Adultery* or *Sacrilege* than *burn.* Suppose a Man should burn for his Neighbour's Wife, or a *Married Man* for another Woman (the Case is not uncommon) do's St *Paul* tell him, he had better *marry* her, than burn for her? No surely. The Reason is, because *Marriage* is not the only Remedy against the *Burnings* of Concupiscence: but Prayer and Mortification join'd with an ardent Love of God will have the same Effect, and that in a much nobler Way. Nay St *Paul* himself had Recourse to this excellent Remedy instead of Marriage against the most violent *Buffets* of *Satan*; and he found it most effectual, as he owns in his Epistles. And this is the very Remedy our *Clergy* and *Religious* are bound to have recourse to in the like Case. So that tho it *be better to marry than burn*, when a Man can do it lawfully, it is still much better to overcome the

Burnings of Concupiſcence by Prayer and Mortification, when he has engaged himſelf in a State, that is inconſiſtent with the Lawfulneſs of Marriage.

» *G.* My Lord, all ſober *Chriſtians*, and even » *Heathens* look upon Marriage as a Preſerver, and » not as a Breach of Chaſtity. St *Peter* calls it a *chaſt* » *Converſation.* 1. Pet. 3. ℣. 2. If it were not ſo, we » may preſume that Chriſt would not have ho» nour'd it with his Preſence and with his firſt Mi» racle, nor make it ſo frequently, as he do's, the » Type and Repreſentation of *Heaven*, and of his » Union with the Church; calling himſelf the *Bride*» *groom*, and her his *Spouſe. pag.* 178.

L. Sr, all this is undeniable of true and lawful Marriage. But tho it be a Preſerver of Chaſtity, it is neither the only one, nor an infallible one, nor the beſt Preſerver of it. This at leaſt I am ſure of, that Chaſtity is not preſerved by *broken Vows*, and *ſacrilegious* Embraces.

» *G.* The *Apoſtle* ſays, *to avoid Fornication let every* » *Man have his own Wife, and every Woman her own* » *Husband.* 1. Cor. 7. ℣. 2. No, ſay you, we except » all the *Clergy*, the *Fryars*, and the *Nuns*, whom we » have put under *Vows* to the contrary. And we will » find other means for them to obtain the *Grace of* » *Continency.* Yes, and the World is full of the Ef» fects of thoſe Means, and knows whether they » are better than thoſe of God's Appointment. It is » ſtrange that you, who have ſo many *Means of* » *Grace* of your own, ſhould not make thoſe very » few, which *Chriſt* has made, ſtand as he left them. » *pag.* 179.

L. Sr, this Grubſtreet Stuff about *our Means of Grace*, and making void the Inſtitutions of Chriſt has already been repeated and anſwer'd ſo often,

that I am perfectly nauseated with it. What Sr! Do's not the Institution of Marriage *stand as Christ left it*, tho St *Paul* excluded *Widows* who had consecrated themselves to God from the Privilege of it; and tho your Church as well as ours forbids it within the *prohibited Degrees*? And if the Institution of Marriage *stands as Christ left it* notwithstanding these Limitations, can a Man of common Sense pretend that our Excluding the *Clergy* from the Privilege of it has alter'd the *Institution of God*?

'Tis true, the *Apostle* says, *to avoid Fornication let every Man have his own Wife, and every Woman her own Husband.* But do's the *Apostle* by those Words oblige all to marry? Or do's he mean that Marriage is the only Means to avoid *Fornication*? If so, why did he not follow his own Rule and marry? Or if this be his Meaning, what Opinion must we have of all the *Widows* and *Widowers*, *Batchelors* and *Maids* of *Great Britain*?

You say, we except the *Clergy*, *Fryars*, and *Nuns*. This is a terrible Grievance indeed. But Saint *Paul* himself has set us the Pattern by excepting *Widows*, that had consecrated themselves to God. *Luther* indeed took another Course, and by the Plenitude of his Power first absolved himself, then as being bound to love his Neighbour as himself, and do by others as he would be done by, absolved both *Priests*, *Fryars* and *Nuns* of all their *Vows*; who thus became fruitful Fathers and Mothers of Children to propagate his Church.

Ay but *we put them under Vows not to marry, and will find other Means for them to obtain the Grace of Continency.* Sr, it is false that *we put them under Vows*. For there is no Force used, but their own free Choice determines them to it. And the means we prescribe them to obtain *the Grace of Continency*, viz. *Retire-*

ment, Prayer, Mortification, and a ſerious Application to the Duties of their reſpective State, are means preſcribed by the *Goſpel* itſelf; which in Spite of your unhandſome Reflection are never fruſtrated of their Effect, when they are rightly uſed.

I ſhall conclude this Subject with the Words of an eminent Proteſtant. *A ſingle Life* (ſays Mr *Thorndike*) *is a ſafer Way to Perfection than Marriage. So is the Profeſſion of the Clergy, and all the Means of farther Retirement from the World------ And the Grace, which our Lord and St* Paul *after him owns in them that do this is not a peculiar Temper of the Body obliging him that has it to live ſingle, and him that has it not to marry, but a ſingular Zeal to wave that, which God makes lawful for us, that we may the better come to his Kingdom; which when it proceeds from a ſingle Eye propoſing to itſelf nothing in this World but the Means of Attaining the World to come, well may we be aſſured of God's Help to Perform it by Virtue of that Promiſe, which the common Chriſtianity chalenges intending nothing but the Effect of it.* Juſt Weights and Meaſures. C. 11. *pag.* 74. 75.

This, Sr, may help to convince you, that the Cauſe you have ſo ſtifly maintain'd is not the moſt honourable, even *our Enemies being Judges.*

§. 45.

Of Purgatory.

» *G.* BUt, My Lord, you extend your Means of » Grace farther than Chriſt did his. For he » appointed none to be uſed for thoſe in the other » World. But you have *Offices* to deliver Souls out » of *Purgatory.* pag. 179.

L. Sr, Chriſt himſelf has inſtituted the holy *Sa-*

crifice of his *Body and Blood*, the Uſe of *Prayers*, *Alms*, *Faſting*, *&c.* and I find no Prohibition in *holy Writ*, that forbids the Application of them to the *Souls departed*. So that our Offering them up for the Delivery of *Souls* out of *Purgatory* cannot but be a very charitable *Office*.

G. But it is a very dark one. We have not a « Word in *Scripture* of any ſuch State of the Dead, « where Souls are put under Pains equal to thoſe of « Hell, except for their Duration. *pag.* 179. «

L. Nor have we it in any Profeſſion of Faith; For all we are bound to believe concerning *Purgatory* is what the *Concil* of *Trent* has defined: viz. *that there is a Purgatory* (or middle State of Souls) *and that the Souls detain'd in it are help'd by the Prayers of the Faithful, eſpecially by the aeceptable Sacrifice of the Altar.* But in what Manner they are tormented, what Sort of Place it is, How great their Torments are, or how long they are to laſt; Theſe are Points, in which the Faith of the Church is not the leaſt concern'd, and you only beat the Air, if you diſpute againſt theſe.

You ſay, *there is not a Word in Scripture of any ſuch State.* If you mean that the Word *Purgatory* is not in Scripture, I eaſily grant it. But the Doctrine of *Purgatory* (as I have ſtated it) is deduced by a clear and neceſſary Conſequence from ſeveral ſcriptural Texts.

Firſt, it is ſaid *Math.* 12. *v.* 32. that *whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him neither in this World, nor in the World to come.* Upon which Text St *Auſtin* diſcourſes thus. *It would not be truly ſaid of ſome Sins that they ſhall neither be forgiven in this World, nor in the World to come, unleſs there were others, which tho not forgiven in this Life, may yet be forgiven in the next.* L. 21. de Civ. Dei. C. 24.

2*ly*, it is ſaid *Rom.* 11. ℣. 6. that *God will render to every Man according to his Deeds.* Whence it follows, that if a Man dies either without having done *worthy Fruits of Penance* for Sins, of which he has ſincerely repented; or with Sins which are not *deadly*, of which he has not repented; ſince God is *infinitly juſt*, and a certain Meaſure of Punishment is due to every Sin, it follows I ſay, that he muſt be punish'd after his Death.

3*ly*, it is ſaid, *Rev.* 21. ℣. 27. *that no unclean Thing ſhall enter into Heaven.* The undeniable Conſequence whereof is, that a Perſon guilty of the very *ſmalleſt Sin* cannot enter into Heaven, becauſe he is render'd *unclean* by it in ſome Degree. Neither can he be damn'd for it, becauſe nothing but *deadly Sin* is punish'd with eternal Flames. There muſt therefore be a *middle State* between *Heaven* and *Hell*, where ſome Sins are both punish'd and expiated; and this we call *Purgatory*, becauſe in *Heaven* there is neither Punishment nor Sins capable of it, and *in Hell there is no Redemption.* Job.

» *G.* But is not the *Blood of Chriſt* ſufficient to » cleanſe us from all Unrighteouſneſs? *pag.* 179.

L. Yes Sr; but if that proves any Thing, it will prove a great Deal too much; and *Hell* will become uſeleſs as well as *Purgatory*.

G. Hold, My Lord: tho *Chriſt* has shed his *Blood* for all, yet he requires a ſincere *Repentance* on our Part as an indiſpenſable Duty to have it applied to us.

L. Very right, Sr. And therefore as it do's not cleanſe us of mortal Sin without Repentance on our Part, ſo neither of venial Sin but upon the ſame Condition. Beſides there may remain a *temporal Punishment* due to Sins, even after we have ſincerely repented of them: and if this Debt be not fully

discharged in this Life, it remains to be paid hereafter.

G. Then the Guilt is not fully forgiven. *p.* 179. «

L. Pardon me Sr, there may be a *temporal Punishment* due for Sins, whereof the *Guilt* is fully forgiven. God said to *David*, *I have put away thy Sin, but the Child shall die.* 2. Sam. 12.

G. And the Reason is given in the next Words, « *because by this Deed thou hast given great Occasion to* « *the Enemies of the Lord to blaspheme*; as if God did « countenance such Wickedness. Therefore *David* « was punish'd so, as his Enemies might perceive it. « God punishes here either to vindicate his own « Honour before Men, or for a Trial of our Faith, « as in the Case of *Job*, and to set forth such as « Examples to others: or for a Proof and Confirmation of our Religion; as in the Case of the « *Prophets*, *Apostles*, *Confessors*, and *Martyrs*: or to « correct and recal obstinate Sinners. Many have « been reform'd by this Means. But all these Reasons respect this Life only. For you say not that « Souls are made *better* in *Purgatory*. For you suppose them to die in the *Love of God*, and to be « in his *Favour* before they go thither. And why then « are they punish'd, since they are not *purified* by « it? *pag.* 179. 180. «

L. Sr, I have hitherto had this Notion of *Purgatory*, that it is a Place, where Souls are *purged* or *purified*, and by Consequence *made better*, and fitted for Heaven. But, pray, what *Roman Catholick* ever told you the contrary? A Person may in this World *love God* above all Things, and be in his *Favour*. Yet I hope this will not hinder him from being *made better* and *purer* than he is already: and so he may be made *better* and *purer* in *Purgatory*, by being cleansed from the Stains his Soul has contracted by vi-

nal Offences. For ſurely a Soul cleanſed from all Defilements of Sin is *purer* and *better*, than whilſt she continues tainted with them.

As to the ſeveral Reaſons you give, why God viſits us with Afflictions in this Life, they are undeniable, but not the only ones. Do Sins deſerve no Punishment? Muſt not the *vindicative Juſtice* of God be ſatisfied?

» *G.* That is ſatisfied before they are forgiven, » and the Sinners received into the Favour of God. » Unleſs you mean by *Vindicative* ſuch a *Spite* and » *Revenge*, as is ſeen amongſt the moſt ignoble Part » of Mankind to ſay, *I will forgive, but I will at the* » *ſame Time be revenged for what is Paſt.* Which in- » deed is not *Forgiveneſs*, but a plain Unwillingneſs » to forgive. *pag.* 180.

L. Sr, this is ſuch a blaſphemous Imagination, as God be praiſed I never heard of before. Was not *Adam's* Sin, and the eternal Punishment due to it forgiven him before he died? I never heard doubted of by any Body. Yet Heaven was shut againſt him in Punishment of it till Mankind was redeem'd: and God demanded an *infinite Satisfaction* for it: which was paid to the full by his only Son becoming Man, and Dying for us. And is this to be call'd *ſuch a Spite and Revenge, as is ſeen amongſt the moſt ignoble Part of Mankind!* For Shame Sr!

» *G.* My Lord, a generous Forgiveneſs upon a » ſincere Repentance loves and embraces, and re- » joices to comfort, and heap Favours like the Fa- » ther of the returning *Prodigal.* pag. 180.

L. And do's not God love and comfort repenting Sinners? And heap ſpiritual Favours upon them, tho he chaſtiſes them temporally for their paſt Sins? 'Tis true, there is no Mention of Punishment in the *Parable*, you have quoted: becauſe

cauſe the whole Drift of it is to ſet forth the Divine Mercies to Sinners that repent ſincerely; And 'tis not neceſſary that all Truths ſhould be mention'd in all Parts of Scripture.

G. God ſays, *he will not remember our Sins, that they ſhall not be mention'd to us in the Day when we turn from our Wickedneſs. Iſa.* 4. *v.* 25. *Jer.* 31. *v.* 34. *Ezek.* 18. *v.* 22. And how is that conſiſtent with Enduring the Pains of Hell for a hundred, perhaps a thouſand Years for ought we know? *p.* 180.

L. Sr, all we know of the Pains of *Purgatory* is, that they are a temporal Punishment juſtly inflicted; and a *temporal Punishment* of Sin is as conſiſtent with *Forgiveneſs*, as God's *Juſtice* is with his *Mercy*. Thus *Adam's* Sin as ſoon as he repented of it was not *remember'd* in the Senſe meant by *Iſaiah*, *Jeremy*, and *Ezekiel*. That is, God entirely forgave him both the *Guilt* and *eternal Punishment* due to it. Yet the Gates of Heaven were ſhut for near 4000 Years after in Punishment of it; And *Adam* himſelf perform'd the Penance of *Eating his Bread in the Sweat of his Brow* enjoin'd him by God for above 900 Years. In like Manner God forgave *David* as ſoon as he confeſs'd his Sin to *Nathan*. But the temporal Punishment of it laſted for many Years after.

G. Yes, My Lord, by Reaſon of the *Scandal*, as I told you.

L. The Scandal, Sr, was a Part of his Sin, and a very conſiderable Part of it, becauſe *it made the Enemies of the Lord to blaſpheme*. Yet tho the *whole Sin* was forgiven (for God forgives not *by Halves*) that Part of it, as you own yourſelf, was punish'd for many Years after; which demonſtrates the Falſehood of what you ſaid juſt now, viz. *that the Juſtice of God is ſatisfied before the Sins are forgiven, and the Parties concern'd received into Favour.*

» *G.* But, My Lord, how do we know what » Souls go to Purgatory? How long they remain » there? And which of them are releaſed? Can » Prayers then for the Releaſe of ſuch and ſuch be » made *in Faith?* Otherwiſe they are *Sin* by the *A-* » *poſtle's* determination. *pag.* 181.

L. I am ſurpriz'd, Sr, how you can propoſe your laſt Queſtion with a ſerious Countenance. However ſince you have ſet me the Example, I ſhall ask one very like it if you will promiſe not to laugh at me for it. *viz.* How you can *pray in Faith* for the Safety of an abſent Friend, who you know not whether he be alive or dead? Will not this alſo be *a Sin by St* Paul's *Determination?* Yes ſurely full as hainous a one as our Praying for Souls, whoſe State we know nothing of. But I ſhould rather think that tho ſuch Prayers have not always their Effect as to the Parties we pray for, they who offer them up will not be deprived of the Reward of their pious and Charitable Intention.

» *G.* Yes, My Lord, all *Superſtition* is very *pious*, » and that is it which deceives. But God has requi- » red that our zeal to him be according to *knowledge*, » and that we intrude not into Things we have not » ſeen. We have not ſeen any *Revelation* for *Purga-* » *tory* or the State of Souls there. *pag.* 181.

L. Sr, they who will not ſee, will not ſee; and are blind not for Want of Eyes, but for Want of *Will* to uſe them. I have already quoted Texts of *Scripture* enough, wherein the *Revelation* of *Purgatory* is as clearly to be ſeen as a Conſequence in it's Principle. And ſo it is neither *Superſtition* nor *Zeal contrary to Knowledge* to pray for the Relief of Souls ſuppoſed to be in that State of Suffering. But beſides it's Foundation in Scriptures it has as uninterrupted a *Tradition* on it's Side as any Article of

Faith; as I shall shew before we have done with this Subject.

§. 46.

Of Tradition.

G. MY Lord, there are *good* and *bad Traditions*, and they are much oftner taken in the bad Senſe throughout the New Teſtament. *Ye have made the Commandement of God of no Effect by your Tradition*, Math. 17. ℣. 6, *Holding the Tradition of the Elders*, Mark. 7. ℣. 3. *Laying aſide the Commandement of God, that ye may keep your own Tradition.* ℣. 9. *Vain Deceit after the Tradition of Men.* Coll. 2. ℣. 8, *Your vain Converſation received by Tradition from your Fathers, &c.* Pet. 1. ℣. 18. *pag.* 181.

L. Sr, all theſe Texts prove very ſolidy what you ſaid firſt, viz. *that there are both good and bad Traditions.* But are *Apoſtolical Traditions* in the Number of *bad ones?* St *Paul* thought not. *Therefore* (ſays he) *Brethren ſtand faſt, and hold the Traditions, which you have been taught whether by Word or our Epiſtle.* 2. Theſſ. 2. ℣. 15. This, Sr, was St *Paul's* Doctrine to the *Theſſalonians.* And I preſume it regarded not them alone, but the whole *Church of Chriſt* both then and in after-ages. I am ſure the holy Fathers underſtood it ſo. Hear what St *Irenæus* ſays. *Suppoſe* (ſays he) *the Apoſtles had left us no Scriptures, ought we not to have follow'd the Rule of Tradition, which they diliver'd to them to whoſe Care they committed the Churches?* L. 3. C. 3.

G. It ſeems then that *Tradition* has the ſame Authority with you as the *Scripture* itſelf.

L. Sr, if you ſpeak of *Tradition* derived from *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, it has ſo: and St *Paul* is my Voucher for it. Nay whoſoever will give himſelf

Leiſure to think muſt be of the ſame Mind. Becauſe whatever *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* taught by *Word of Mouth* was without all Diſpute as truly the *Word of God*, as what the Apoſtles have deliver'd to us in their Writings. So that tho Scriptures rightly underſtood be a *Rule of Faith* to the Church, yet ſince *Chriſt* laid the Foundation of it by Preaching only, and the *Apoſtles* preach'd ſeveral Years before they wrote any of the *Canonical Books*, it follows that the *unwritten Word* was the firſt Rule of Chriſtian Belief, which could not loſe it's Authority by the After-writing of the Apoſtles.

G. My Lord, all that the Apoſtles taught by *Word of Mouth* was afterwards ſet down in the *Canonical Books*.

L. Pray what Authority either of *Scripture* or *Fathers* have you for this? St *Chryſoſtom* is poſitive for the Contrary. *It is clear*, ſays he, *that the Apoſtles did not deliver all Things in Writing, but many Things without it: and Theſe too deſerve to be believed. Let us then give Credit to the Tradition of the Church. 'Tis Tradition, ſeek no farther.* L. de Spirit. Sancto. C. 29.

St *Epiphanius* ſays the ſame. *Tradition too* (ſays he) *is neceſſary. For all Things cannot be had from the Scripture. Therefore the Bleſſed Apoſtles left ſome Things in Writing, and others by Tradition.* Thus St *Epiphanius*. Hær. 61. Nay St *Paul* himſelf directed the *Theſſalonians* to the *unwritten Word*, as has been ſhew'd; and in the only Epiſtle he wrote to the *Galatians* he refers them to what he had taught them by Word of Mouth. *Tho we*, ſays he, *or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Goſpel unto you, than that which we have preach'd unto you, let him be accurſed.* Gal. 1. ℣. 8.

G. My Lord, there is a *Tradition*, which for the Evidence of it we are willing to admit. That is, according to the Rule of *Vincentius Lirinenſis*,

that which was always received, every where, and by « *all.* And we are willing to join Iſſue with you upon « this Tradition as to *Purgatory*, that is, *univerſal* « *Tradition.* And you would not deſire we ſhould be « convinced by any *particular Tradition* of this or « that Church or Place. For you know there are « many Deceits in ſuch. *pag.* 181. 182. «

L. Sr, if I don't miſtake your Meaning, the *univerſal Tradition* upon which you are willing to join iſſue with us is of ſo large a Size, that not one ſingle Article of the *Creed* can come up to it. For every Article of it, particularly that of the *Divinity of Chriſt*, has been denied by *many*. It has not therefore been received *by All*. And ſince thoſe Many had a Being in *ſome Time*, and in *ſome Place*, it has not been received *always*, and *every where*. You may therefore ſafely join iſſue with me even as to *Purgatory* upon this pretty Notion of *univerſal Tradition* without Approaching one Step nearer to it. For *Aerius* an *ancient Reformer* in the 4th Century denied it, and was writ againſt by the Fathers of that and the following Age; and you yourſelf, who deny it now, are *ſomebody*, and exiſtent in ſome *Time* and *Place*; which I ſuppoſe ſuffices to prove that it has not been received *always*, *every where*, and *by All*.

But to be more ſerious upon the Matter, thoſe Truths are ſaid to have an *univerſal Tradition*, even according to the true Meaning of *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, which tho they have been or are ſtill oppoſed by *Hereticks*, are derived from the *Apoſtles* themſelves, and have been always acknowledg'd as ſuch by the *Catholick Church* and all true Members of it throughout the whole World: which *Vincentius Lirinenſis* calls *being received always, every where, and by All*. And this *univerſal Tradition* we have for *Purgatory*, tho not the chimerical one upon which I pre-

ſume you are willing to join Iſſue with us.

» *G.* My Lord, *Veron* in his *Rule of Faith* (a Book » much applauded in *France*, and put into *English* » for the Uſe of *Roman Catholicks* here) ſets out in » the Beginning with a Definition of the Rule of » Faith, of which he makes the firſt Requiſite to be » for an Article of Faith, *that it be clearly reveal'd in* » *Scripture* (and by no pretended *Revelation* to any » whatſoever) *in expreſs Words*, or thence to be de- » duced by neceſſary Conſequence. Which when » made appear as to *Purgatory* or any other Doc- » trines in Diſpute, we ſhall readily allow it; and » till then we cannot be arraign'd of *Hereſy* for not » Profeſſing to believe it.

» This *Intruding into Things we have not ſeen pro-* » *ceeds*, as the *Apoſtle* obſerves Col. 2. ℣. 18. from a » *fleshly Mind* meaſuring *ſpiritual* Things by *carnal*. » We ſee it takes Time to purge the Flesh of Di- » ſeaſes and Defilements it has contracted. And it » takes a great Deal of Filing and Scrubbing to » cleanſe iron, that has been long ruſted. Hence » you conjecture the ſame as to Souls depar- » ted, that they muſt be purged by *Fire*. But the » Work of God upon the *Soul* when he grants » true Repentance, operates far otherwiſe. It ef- » fects the Cure all at once, as with thoſe who » look'd upon the *brazen Serpent*. Our Saviour him- » ſelf makes the Compariſon. *Joh.* 3. ℣. 14. 15. And » he gave us an Example of it in the Thief upon » the Croſs, who was tranſlated to Paradiſe the ſame » Day he died: and yet he had been a grievous Sin- » ner, and ſuffer'd juſtly for his Offences. His Re- » pentance was late, and he had made no Reſtitu- » tion: yet he did no Penance in *Purgatory*. pag. 181, » 182.

§. 47.

The Subject of Purgatory *resumed.*

L. SIR, according to your laudable Custom you have made some commodious Alterations in *Veron's* Words. For his true Words are these [English'd by E. S. Esq. Paris. Ann. 1660. pag. 1.] *the total and only Rule of the Catholick Faith is Divine Revelation deliver'd to the Prophets and Apostles,* PROPOSED BY THE CATHOLICK CHURCH *in her general Councils, or by her universal Practice to be believed as an Article of Catholick Faith.* And pray, Sr, is it the same Thing *to be reveal'd to the Apostles*, and *to be clearly written by them?* Did they *write* every Thing that was *reveal'd* to them? The contrary is most certain, as has been fully shew'd. So that if *Veron* had set out with the Definition of his Rule of Faith, as you have cook'd it for him, instead of being applauded as he now is, he would have been condemn'd for an *Heretick.*

However suppose you had made no Change in his Words, you would be bound to believe the *Doctrine of Purgatory* according to the latter Part of his Rule, as quoted by you. Because the *Doctrine of Purgatory* is *deduced by a necessary Consequence* from several Texts of Scripture, as I have fully proved.

You say, *Souls are not gradually cured like Bodies but all at once, when God grants true Grace and Repentance.* Sr, if you mean that the *Guilt* of *mortal* or *venial* Sin is not pardon'd *by Halves* but all at once: Or, that when a Soul is tainted with many *mortal Sins*, one cannot be pardon'd without the other: Or finally, that God conveys a Soul in an Instant from the State of *Sin* to that of *sanctifying Grace*, what you

ſay is very true, but nothing to your Purpoſe. Becauſe, when the whole *Guilt* of Sin is pardon'd, the *temporal Punishment* is not always remitted with it, as has been proved to a Demonſtration. And if the Divine Juſtice be not fully ſatisfied in this Life, there muſt be a State in the Life to come wherein full Satisfaction may be made, and the Debt that has been contracted *paid to the laſt Farthing.*

Beſides a Soul cleanſed from the Guilt of mortal Sin may ſtill be ſtain'd with many leſſer Offences or even Affections to 'em, which are all Blemishes and muſt be wash'd off before she can be admitted into Heaven, where nothing that is unclean can enter. And where then will you find in *Scripture* or indeed any where but in your own Imagination; that all Souls are perfectly cured in a Trice, and ſtand in no Need of having their Cure perfected hereafter? This indeed is properly *Intruding into Things we have not ſeen.*

You mention the *brazen Serpent*, at the Sight whereof Bodies were cured; and you add, *that Chriſt himſelf made the Compariſon.* So he did; but the Compariſon he made is this. viz. *That as* Moſes *lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderneſs, even ſo muſt the Son of Man ſhall be lifted up, that whoſoever believeth in him may not perish, but have Life everlaſting.* Joh. 3. ℣. 14. 15: Whence you conclude, Therefore *all Souls are perfectly cured at once.* Is not this Trifling with the Words of Chriſt inſtead of Treating them with a ſerious Regard to their true Meaning.

But the *Thief* on the Croſs, *tho he had been a grievous Sinner, and repented late, and made no Reſtitution, yet* (ſay you) *he did no Penance in Purgatory.* I hope, Sr, you don't mean this as an *innuendo*, that the Way to go ſtrait to Heaven is to *ſin grievouſly, repent late*, and *make no Reſtitution.* But let that paſs:

whoſoever

whoſoever ſuffers as much, and with the ſame *Humility*, *Patience*, *Reſignation*, *Faith*, and *Zeal* as the good Thief did on the Croſs, needs not be afraid of *Purgatory*. But I fear there are but few Death-bed Penitents in the World like him.

G. My Lord, it is more than we know whether he might not have been converted before. But however it ſhews there is no neceſſity of *Purgatory* even for very great Offenders. *pag.* 183.

L. Very true, Sr, not for any Offenders, that become ſuch Penitents as the good Thief was.

ADVERTISEMENT.

To theſe laſt Words of the Gentleman *in his* Caſe ſtated *his* Lordſhip *gives this childiſh Anſwer.*

No doubt but God may excuſe whom he pleaſes. *To which the* Gentleman *replies thus.*

G. How then do we know whom he excuſes and whom not? And how can we pray *in Faith*, that is, *without Sin* to deliver ſuch a particular Perſon from *Purgatory?* pag. 183.

L. In the ſame Manner, Sr, as you pray *in Faith* and *without Sin* for the Safety of a Friend in the *Army* or at *Sea*, who you know not whether he be alive or Dead.

As to your Queſtion, *how we know whom God excuſes and whom not?* Sr, God might have forgiven if he had pleaſed all our Sins without ſubjecting us to any temporal Punishment for them. But this is not the Order his infinite Wiſdom has eſtabliſh'd. And therefore, as he excuſes no Sinner from *Repentance*, ſo he excuſes none that we know from *Doing worthy Fruits of Penance*: and Punishing our Sins is one of thoſe *worthy Fruits*. Which if we have

not fully perform'd in this Life, the Deficiency muſt be made good in the next.

» *G.* But if there was no Neceſſity of *Purgatory*, » as you have granted, in the Caſe of the *Thief*, » how is it to be imagined that God ſhould keep » ſo many thouſand Souls for many Years and Ages » in the moſt extreme Torments, when there is no » Neceſſity for it? *pag.* 183.

L. Sr, neither you nor I can know, how long Souls are detain'd in Purgatory. But there is always a Neceſſity that God's Will be accomplish'd, and we are very ſure that none are punish'd longer than they deſerve. And the Reaſon why the good Thief had no *Purgatory* was, becauſe the *Divine Juſtice* was ſatisfy'd before he died: and if all died as he did, the Neceſſity of *Purgatory* would ceaſe.

» *G.* My Lord, if the *Pope* has Power to releaſe » out of Purgatory, he muſt be a very cruel Fa- » ther, who keeps one Soul there an Hour longer. » *pag.* 183.

L. You may as well call him a very cruel Father for not hindring *Plagues*, *Wars*, *Famines*, *Hurricans*, *Earthquakes*, and other ſuch Puniſhments of Sin. Sr, there are about twenty Reaſons more or leſs, why the Pope do's not releaſe all Souls out of *Purgatory*. And the firſt of theſe Reaſons is, becauſe he *cannot*. For if he could, he certainly would do it. I omit the reſt for Brevity Sake.

But has it not been the Diſcipline of the Church in all Ages to impoſe Penances for Sins by the Power of the keys? And are then all her Biſhops and Paſtors cruel Fathers for not Remitting the *Penalty* together with the *Guilt*? Are they not the Miniſters of God's *Juſtice* as well as *Mercy*? Or do they not act by Commiſſion from him?

» *G.* My Lord, the Church knows not the Heart,

and muſt Judge by outward Signs, which yet ſe- «
cure not from Hypocriſy. But this is all foreign «
to God, who ſearches the Heart, and knows all «
that is in Man, *pag.* 184. «

L. But as the Church can abſolve from *Sins* with- «
out an infallible knowledge of the Diſpoſition of «
Men's Hearts, why might she not alſo without that «
infallible knowledge abſolve them from all *Penalty* «
whatſoever, were she not certain that in ſo Doing «
she would act contrary to the *Order* eſtabliſh'd by «
God? So that 'tis manifeſt it always was the Church's «
Faith, that there is a *temporal* Puniſhment due to Sin «
even after the *Guilt* together with the *eternal* Puniſh- «
ment is remitted. «

G. My Lord, tho our Phyſick of Diſcipline «
Works by Degrees, and the Iſſue is uncertain, «
yet God never cures imperfectly. *Chriſt* never «
half-heald any Man. And ſo it is when he pardons «
Sinners. *Thy Sins are forgiven thee*, it is not ſaid «
ſhall be forgiven, or when thou haſt perform'd «
ſuch or ſuch a Penance; but the Forgiveneſs «
of his Sins was as immediately wrought as the «
Cure of his Body. And God gives us all the Aſ- «
ſurances that can be in the ſtrongeſt Expreſſions «
of out Sins being abſolutely and totally forgiven. «
As *being all blotted out, and caſt into the Depths of* «
the Sea. Never to be remember'd or mention'd unto us «
any more, as before quoted. *I will heal their Back-* «
ſliding, I will love thee freely. He is ready to forgive, «
he waiteth to have mercy, he earneſtly remembreth, his «
Bowels are troubled for Sinners, that they may repent; «
and *in the Day they turn from their Wickedneſs he for-* «
giveth. For he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the «
Children of Men, It is for their Repentance and Re- «
formation. But this Conſideration is not in *Purga-* «
tory, p. 184, 185. «

L. What a ſtrange Profuſion of Texts have we here again to no Manner of Purpoſe! Any one of them ſuffices to prove that the *Guilt of Sin* with the *eternal Punishment* due to it is never pardon'd imperfectly or *by Halves*, and a thouſand of them can prove no more. Why then are they thus multiplied but for a Shew to impoſe upon the Ignorant. Hear what St *Auſtin* ſays concerning the temporal Punishment of Sin after the Guilt is pardon'd. *The Punishment of Sin*, ſays he, *continues after the Guilt is pardon'd leaſt the Guilt should be thought little, if the Punishment ended with it*, Trac. 124. in *Joanem*. Hence it is even conducing to our Salvation, that God do's not always remit at once both the temporal and eternal Punishment: that we may feel ſenſibly the Effects both of his *Mercy* and *Juſtice*, and not abuſe by repeated Crimes the Facility of his Pardon: as St *Auſtin* alſo obſerves upon the 8th Verſe of the 50th Pſalm.

§. 48.

Of Merits.

G. BUt, My Lord, how will the poor Souls in *Purgatory* (if any be there) be deluded, if the Stock of *Supererogation* ſhould fail them; that is, the *Merits* of *Saints* for their good Works, which they have done over and above their Duty, and what they were obliged to for their Salvation; and therefore are applied to others, who have come ſhort of their Duty to ſupply their Deficiencies, which is the *Fund* provided for the Diſcharge of Priſoners out of *Purgatory*? and this is diſpended by the *Pope* to whom he thinks fit, as being the grand *Treaſurer* of the Church, and conſequently of thoſe ſuperabundant Merits of the

Saints. But we want a *Text*, where St *Peter* was so conſtituted ſuch a *Treaſurer*, or that there is or can be ſuch a Treaſury. *pag.* 185.

L. St. I am as much a Stranger to any ſuch Text as yourſelf. And as I am not bound in a Diſpute about Religion to maintain meer *School-Opinions*, in which the Church's Faith is not concern'd, ſo neither am I bound to produce any *Scripture-Texts* for them. However thus far is certain, that the *Saints* pray for all their Fellow-members who ſtand in Need of it; and their Prayers are acceptable to God, and available in Behalf of thoſe they pray for in proportion to the Degree of Holineſs, they attained to in this Life. And in this Senſe their paſt *Merits* and *Sufferings* may be ſaid to be applicable to others: *viz.* in as much as they give an Efficacy to their Prayers to move God to have Compaſſion on thoſe they pray for. As the Prayer of *Moſes* appeaſed God's Wrath againſt the *Iſraelits*; and as *Job's* Praying for his three Friends had the ſame Effect. And finally, as the Prayers and Extraordinary Mortifications of God's ſpecial Servants upon Earth often move him to beſtow the Grace of a ſincere Converſion on Sinners, who deſerve nothing but to be abandon'd by him.

But ſince the *Merits* and *Prayers* of God's Saints either in Heaven or on Earth have no other Value, than what they derive from the *Merits of Chriſt*, I muſt here bring you acquainted with a *Fund* for the Diſcharge of the *Priſoners* in *Purgatory*, which I preſume you will not venture to burleſque for your Diverſion. I mean, the *infinite Price* of the *ſacred Blood of Chriſt*, and the *inexhauſtible Treaſure* of his *Merits*: which Fund I hope is ſecure, and in no Danger of Failing. So that your mighty Concern leaſt the poor Souls in *Purgatory* ſhould find themſelves

left in the Lurch, *if their Stock of Supererogation should fail them*, is wholly owing either to your real, or affected Misunderstanding of the most essential Part of our Doctrine. For it cannot be doubted, but that the *infinite Merits* and *Satisfaction* of *Christ* will always be a sufficient *Fund* to release the Prisoners.

But I know not, whether I must ascribe it to a Want of Charity, or Judgment, or both; when you express our Doctrine of *Merit* and *Supererogation* in these improper and equivocal Terms, viz. *that the Saints are obliged for their Salvation to the Merits of their own good Works, which they have done over and above their Duty.* Every Word whereof carries a double Meaning; but the bad one is uppermost, and offers itself at first Sight.

Wherefore to prevent all Mistakes, I desire you to observe, that it is our Doctrine that all, who are saved, owe their Salvation (if we will speak properly) purely to the *Mercy* and *Grace* of God through the *infinite Merits* and *Meditation* of *Jesus-Christ*. *First*, because no Man can merit the first *justifying Grace*: as is expressly taught by the *Council* of *Trent* in the following Words. *'Tis therefore said, that we are justified gratis, because none of the Acts which precede Justification, whether they be Faith, or good Works, can merit this Grace.* Sess. 6. C. 6. As therefore we owe that which is the Groundwork and Foundation of our eternal Happiness to the pure Liberality of God, so are we by Consequence indebted to him for that Happiness, which cannot be attain'd without it.

2dly, tho the Virtues which we practise, and the good Works which we perform in the State of Grace be most certainly conducing to Salvation, and even merit an Increase of Grace, yet since those very *Virtues* and good *Works* are not only the

Gifts of God, but derive all the Merit they have from his *ſanctifying Grace* and the *Merits of Chriſt*, it follows, that we have the ſame Obligation to God for our eternal Happineſs, as if he beſtow'd it upon us without any Concurrence or Cooperation on our Part. Nay our Obligation is rather the greater, becauſe that very *Concurrence* or *Cooperation* on our Part is an additional Favour we receive of him, and ſo entirely the Fruit of his holy Grace, that we cannot (independently of it) without Preſumption aſcribe it to ourſelves according to theſe Words of St *Paul*, *What haſt thou that thou didſt not receive? and if thou didſt receive it, why doſt thou glory, as if thou hadſt not received it?* 1. Cor. 4. ℣. 7. and again, *For it is God, who worketh in us both to will and to do of his good Pleaſure.* Philip. 2. ℣. 13.

Yet all this notwithſtanding it is undoubtedly true, that our Salvation depends upon the Practice of Virtue and good Works: becauſe the Word of God declares poſitively, that we cannot be ſaved without it. *If thou will't enter into Life, keep the Commandements*, ſays *Chriſt*, Math. 19. ℣. 17. and St *James* tells us, that *Faith if it hath not Works is dead.* James 2. ℣. 17. If then we cannot be ſaved without keeping the Commandements and the Practice of good Works, our Salvation is Owing to it in the ſame Senſe as it depends upon it. Nor do's this derogate in the leaſt from the *Glory* due to *God*: becauſe Owing our Salvation to the *Virtues* and *good Works* we practiſe is in Effect Owing it to the *Gifts of God*: becauſe we can neither practiſe any Virtue, nor perform any good Work without the Aſſiſtance of his Grace, *who worketh in us both to will, and to do of his good Pleaſure.* Philip. 2. ℣. 13.

G. But, My Lord, how do's all this conſiſt with your Doctrine of *Merits*?

L. Not at all, Sr, as *Proteſtants* will needs underſtand it for us: but as we underſtand it nothing is more eaſy. I ſhall therefore explain it briefly to you. The *Council* of *Trent* ſpeaks thus of it: *To thoſe, who place their Confidence in God, and continue in the Practice of good Works, eternal Life ought to be propoſed both as a Grace mercifully promiſed to the Children of God through Jeſus-Chriſt, and as a Reward faithfully to be render'd by Virtue of that Promiſe to their good Works and Merits.* Seſſ. 6. C. 16.

Here is all that is of Faith relating to the Article of *Merit*; concerning which *Proteſtants* have taken the utmoſt Pains to poiſon the People with falſe Notions of our Doctrine. And I do not wonder at it. Becauſe Miſtating a Doctrine is the moſt expedite Way to confute it. For it coſts no Labour of the Brain; but with a little Pliableneſs of Conſcience makes Truth and Falſehood ſhift Sides in a Trice. I ſhall put a Queſtion or two to cleat the Matter. Pray, Sr, has not God promiſed *eternal Life* to ſuch as perform the Conditions required of them?

G. Who doubts it?

L. And is not this a *Covenant*, or a kind of *Contract* or *Bargain* betwixt God and Man?

G. I cannot deny it.

L. Well, and are not all *Contracts* or *Bargains* binding on both Sides, ſo that if the Conditions ſtipulated be perform'd by the one, the other is bound to make good his Part? I am ſenſible this Queſtion preſſes ſomewhat hard upon you. For it follows from it, that if we perform our Part of the *Covenant* God has made with us, we deſerve the promiſed Reward, and have a *juſt Title* to it by Virtue of his *Promiſe*. And this is that frightful Bugbear, which we call *Merits*.

G. But, My Lord, are our Works then in this Life *equal* to the R[illegible]rd?

L. No;

L. No, Sr, they are not *equal* to it. Nay tho we did ten thouſand Times more, they would bear no Proportion to it: becauſe God has been ſo bountiful as to promiſe a Reward infinitly ſurpaſſing our Works. But ſtill they are a *Reward*, and a Reward *promiſed* upon ſuch and ſuch Conditions, as he thought fit to impoſe. And if God's ſacred Promiſe be ſufficient to ground a ſure and juſt Title, they who perform the Conditions upon which Heaven is promiſed, have the ſureſt and juſteſt Title to it, that a Man can have to any Thing.

G. But do's not *Chriſt* ſay, that *when we have done all we are commanded, we are unprofitable Servants?* Luke 17. *v.* 10. and how then can we pretend to any *Merits*, or Works of *Supererogation?*

L. Sr, when we *have done all we are commanded*, we are wholly *unprofitable to God:* for he cannot receive any Profit by us. Neither do's he ſtand in Need of his Servants, but his Servants ſtand in Need of him. Yet ſince we are his *Servants*, when we have done what we are commanded, we have a Title to the *Wages* he has promiſed us. For a *Covenant*, *Contract*, or *Bargain* holds between God and Man, as well as between Man and Man. And God who is juſt will certainly pay us our *Wages* according to the Work we have done.

But we are over and above *unprofitable Servants* in another Senſe even when we have done all we are commanded. Becauſe *we are inſufficient of ourſelves even to think any Thing as of ourſelves, but our Sufficiency is of God.* 2. Cor. 3. *v.* 5. So that we can do nothing of what we are commanded in Order to Salvation, unleſs we be enabled by God's Grace to do it. And can any Thing be more unprofitable than a Servant, that can do nothing without the Help of his Maſter?

Hence St *Auſtin* has left us theſe excellent Words, which contain a full Defence of the Doctrine of *Merits*, and ſhew what the Church's Faith was in his Time. *Eternal Life* (ſays he) *is call'd by the Apoſtle the Gift of God.* NOT THAT IT IS NOT GIVEN TO MERITS, BUT BECAUSE THE MERITS THEMSELVES, TO WHICH IT IS GIVEN, *are likewiſe his Gifts.* And again. *When God crowns our Merits, what elſe do's he crown but his own Gifts?* L. de gratia & lib. Arb. and ſo we are always *unprofitable Servants.*

Neither is this inconſiſtent with what we call Works of *Supererogation*, if you will but vouchſafe to underſtand the Word as we do. A Queſtion or two will lead us to the true Meaning of it. I ask then, whether there be not *Counſels* as well as *Precepts!*

G. Who doubts it?

L. Well, Sr, and are we bound in Conſcience to practiſe the *Evangelical Counſels?* Are we bound, for Example, *to ſell all we have and give it to the Poor?*

G. No ſurely.

L. He then that practiſes this or any other *Evangelical Counſel*, do's a Work of *Supererogation.* That is, he do's a Thing he is not bound to do. And this is preciſely our Meaning of that Word. But if you fix another Meaning upon it, and tell the People, *that we pretend to do all we are commanded and more*, i. e. *to be wholly free from Sin*, I muſt accuſe you either of Ignorance, or wilful Slander. For we utterly deny it, as being contrary to God's Word which tells us, that *in many Things we all offend* James 3. ℣. 2. And, that *if we ſay we have no Sin we deceive ourſelves, and the Truth is not in us.* 1. Joh. 1. ℣. 8. Now Sr you may put what Objections you pleaſe.

§. 49.

Objections anſwer'd.

G. MY Lord, can a Creature merit at the « Hands of God for ever ſo great Endow- « ments beſtow'd upon him? Is it a *Merit* to receive « great Gifts? *pag.* 185. «

L. Sr, God can reward nothing but *his own Gifts.* But ſince he has promiſed to reward them, they certainly deſerve their Reward in Virtue of that *Promiſe*, and muſt by Conſequence be a *Merit* in his Sight. Which made St *Auſtin* ſay, that *God has made himſelf a Debtor to us not by Receiving, but by Promiſing.* Pſal. 83. You ask, *if it be a Merit to receive great Gifts?* I anſwer it is no *Merit*, if we abuſe them. But to employ as we ought the *Gifts* we receive, is certainly a *Merit* through God's Goodneſs, who has promiſed to reward them.

G. But if we employ them to the beſt Advan- « tage, is it more than is our Duty to do? *pag.* 185. «

L. No, Sr, but God rewards his Servants for Doing their Duty, and we merit Heaven by it.

G. And we are ſtill *unprofitable Servant*, as *Chriſt* « himſelf has told us. *pag.* 185. «

L. We are ſo. But ſtill we are *Servants*, and work for *Wages.* And the Wages promiſed us is *eternal Life.*

G. But was there ever a Man (*Chriſt* alone ex- « cepted) *who did all his Duty?* Are not all *Sinners?* « And if their Repentance entitles them to Pardon, « this is far from *Merit*: my Doing my Duty to « Day makes no Amends for my having neglected « it Yeſterday. *pag.* 185. 186. «

L. Sr, you ſeem to make no Difference betweeu

venial Offences, and *deadly Sin*. This deprives us of *Sanctifying Grace*, which conſtitutes us the *adoptive Sons* of God, his *Heirs* and *Coheirs of Chriſt*; and is the interiour Foundation of *Merit* in the Soul, to which God has promiſed *eternal Life*, and an Encreaſe of Glory in Proportion to the meritorious Works, whereof it is the Source and Principle through the *Merits* of *Jeſus-Chriſt*. But *venial Offences* deſtroy not this Foundation; tho they ſuffice to denominate all Men *Sinners*, even the greateſt *Saints*, who *all offend in many Things*. *James* 3. *v.* 2. And ſo your Queſtions are fully anſwer'd. And it is manifeſt, that tho all be *Sinners* in the Senſe meant by St *James*, yet this hinders not, but that there are many, who being free from *deadly Sin* are properly call'd *juſt* or *righteous* according to *Scripture-language*: and theſe are in a State of *Meriting* the Pardon of their *daily Failings*, and Attoning or *Making Amends* for them by the Practice of good Works join'd with Repentance.

» *G.* We find the greateſt Saints applying to the » Mercy of God, and not pleading their own *Me-* » *rits*. *Jacob* ſaid, *I am not worthy of the leaſt of all thy* » *Mercies*. And *Job*, who had *none like him in the* » *Earth*, *a perfect and upright Man*, &c. ſaid *I abhor* » *myſelf*, *and repent in Duſt and Aſhes*. And *Daniel* » the Man *greatly beloved*, confeſs'd his own Sins as » well as the Sins of the People. And St *Paul* call'd » himſelf the *Chief of Sinners*, not worthy to be an » *Apoſtle*. pag. 186.

L. What Wonder is it, that the *Saints* on Earth (who had the deepeſt Senſe of their own natural Corruption, and the Offences they had committed againſt God) both thought and ſpoke thus humbly of themſelves? For they would not have been *Saints* without it; and their Humility was their *brighteſt*

Merit, and a moſt ſpecial *Gift of God*. Nay they would have acted very preſumptuouſly, had they *pleaded their own Merits*, and not applied themſelves to the *Mercy of God*. 1. becauſe no Man knows what *Merits* he has, or whether he be worthy of God's *Love* or *Hatred*. and 2*dly*, becauſe all *Merits* are the *Mercies* and *Gifts* of God through *Jeſus-Chriſt*.

G. But if the *Saints* own no *Merit* in themſelves, « then ſurely they will diſown all thoſe, who apply « to their *Merits*: and as I ſaid before concerning « the *Worſhip* and *Invocation* of them, by which you « hope to gain them to be *Interceſſors* for you they « muſt become your *Accuſers* by the Denial of their « Acceptance of ſuch Worſhip from you, which if « they ſhould accept, it would make them *evil Spi-* « *rits*, as I have quoted out St *Auſtin*. pag. 186. «

L. Sr, the Saints on Earth ſee nothing of their own *Merits*. Their Humility is induſtrious to hide every Thing from them but their *Faults*. But in Heaven, where there is no Danger of *Vanity*, they are happy in the experimental knowledge of their paſt Virtues and *Merits* by the Degree of *Glory*, whereof they are ſecurely in Poſſeſſion: and therefore we need not fear their Diſpleaſure by our Honouring thoſe Merits, which have raiſed them to that Glory: eſpecially ſince they are not ignorant, that Honouring their *Merit* is but Honouring the *Gifts of God*.

But, Sr, as to your Quotation from St *Auſtin* againſt our *Honouring* and *Invoking* the *Saints*, I am ſorry you give me ſo often Occaſion to reproach you with your ſhameful Falſification of that Father. For it obliges me to an ungrateful Task; and I bluſh for you as often as I am forced to do it.

G. But, My Lord, what Creature dares plead « Purity before God? *Behold he chargeth his Angels* «

» with Folly, and he putteth no Truſt in his Saints. Yea » the Heavens are not clean in his Sight. How much » more abominable and filthy is Man, who drinketh ini- » quity like Water? And what is Man, that he ſhould » be clean? And he that is born of a Woman, that » he ſhould be righteous? Job. 4. ℣. 18. And if *all our* » *Righteouſneſſes are as filthy Rags.* Iſa. 44. ℣. 6. If there » be Iniquity in our *holy Things*, in the *holy Sanctuary* » *and Altar*, what then is clean? *pag.* 186. 187.

L. Sr, your firſt Queſtion is, *what Creature dares plead Purity before God?* And all the Texts you have produced are to prove, that no Man can without Preſumption make this Plea: which I readily grant. *Becauſe we all offend in many Things.* But amongſt thoſe who *offend in many Things*, it is to be hoped there are many who do not offend God *mortally*. And theſe are in a State of *Meriting* the Reward, which God promiſed to thoſe, who live and die in his holy Grace. Nay you own'd juſt now that *Job* was a *perfect and upright Man.* So that all that can be concluded from the Texts you have quoted is that Man of himſelf, and without the Grace of *Jeſus-Chriſt* is nothing but Weakneſs, Corruption, and Sin.

» *G.* My Lord, if *the righteous themſelves ſhall ſcarce-* » *ly be ſaved*, as St *Peter* tells us Ch. 4. ℣. 18. what » *Merits* have they to ſpare for others, eſpecially » when they are not ſaved even by their own » Works? For *by Grace ye are ſaved, not by Works,* » *leaſt any Man ſhould boaſt.* Eph. 2. ℣. 8. 9. Can any » Man then boaſt of his Works as not only ſuffi- » cient for his own Salvation, but over and above » as *meritorious* to be applied to others, and to de- » liver Souls out of *Purgatory*? No, My Lord, the » *Saints* make no ſuch *boaſts*, and will diſown all » thoſe, who make them in their Name. For they » know that *all have ſinned, and come ſhort of the Glory*

of God being juſtified freely by his Grace through the « *Redemption that is in* Jeſus-Chriſt ------ *Where is* « *Boaſting then? It is excluded. By what Law? Of* « *Works? Nay, but by the Law of Faith.* Rom. 3. ℣. « 23. 24. 27. *pag.* 187. «

L. Really, Sr, one would think you had read the Scripture for nothing elſe, but to miſapply and abuſe it. Your firſt Text from St *Peter* ſpeaks of the Difficulty of being ſaved, and the Severity of God's Judgment; which no Man ſurely doubts of. Yet for all that, 'tis certain the *Saints* are ſaved; and it is no leſs certain, that the *Virtues* and *good Works*, which through *God's Grace* they have practiſed in this Life, were a Means to bring them to that happy State. Unleſs you will ſay, that *good Works* are not *neceſſary* not *conducing* to Salvation: which I preſume is not the Doctrine of your Church.

The Subject of the whole Chapter to the *Epheſians* whence you have taken your ſecond Text, is to render them ſenſible, that their being converted from *Idolatry* to the *Faith of Chriſt* was not in the leaſt Owing to any preceding Merit of good Works, but wholly to the *Goodneſs of God*, and the *Grace* and *Merits of Jeſus Chriſt*. And is not this wonderfully to the Purpoſe? Your argument runs thus. *Idolaters wallowing in all Sorts of Sins do not merit the Grace of their Converſion*, therefore *Chriſtians that live well, do not deſerve to go Heaven.* Fine Stuff indeed!

Your third Text from St *Paul* to the *Romans* is immediately follow'd by theſe Words. *Therefore we conclude, that a Man is juſtified by Faith without the Deeds of the Law.* ℣. 28. Which ſhews that the Apoſtle's main Scope in that Chapter was to convince theconverted *Jews* at *Rome*, that they were to be ſaved not by the *Works of the Law*, but by their *Faith* in *Jeſus-Chriſt*. And that therefore they had no

Reaſon to *boaſt*, as they did, of the *Works of the Law*. But do's *Faith in Chriſt* exclude the neceſſity of *good Works*?

G. But can a Man then *boaſt* of his *good Works*? I believe the *Saints* make no ſuch Boaſt, nor deſire others to make it for them.

L. Sr, no Man can boaſt of his *good Works* or *Merits*, let them be never ſo great: *But he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord*, ſays St *Paul* 2. Cor. 10. ℣. 7. becauſe all *Merits* are the *Gifts of God*: and *when God crowns our Merits, he only rewards his own Gifts*: as St *Auſtin* has already told us. So that I am wholly of your Mind, that *the Saints make no ſuch Boaſts*. Nor do I know any who make them in their Name: tho we all *praiſe God in his Saints*; as we are directed by the *Pſalmiſt*. Pſal. 150. ℣. 1. And deſire them to intercede both for ourſelves and the Souls departed; not doubting but their paſt *Merits* render their Prayers acceptable to God, and available for the Relief of others. But that the Saints have *any Merits to ſpare*, or that their *Merits* are *applicable* to others any other Way than that of *Interceſſion* or *Impetration*, as I have explain'd it, is a Doctrine I am utterly a ſtranger to.

» *G.* Every Man, My Lord, is ſaved by his own » Faith, not by the Faith of others. And God *will* » *reward every Man according to his Works*, not the » Works of others. *Math.* 16. ℣. 27. p. 187.

L. That's very certain. God will reward none for other Men's Works; but *he will reward every one according to his own Works*. Pray remember that; for thoſe very Words decide the Queſtion againſt you. Becauſe if *Salvation* be the *Reward of good Works*, as it moſt certainly is, nay a Reward ſtipulated between God and Man by Virtue of his *Promiſe*, it follows, that when the *Works* to which *Heaven* is promiſed

promiſed as a *Reward*, are perform'd we *deſerve* or *Merit* the Reward.

G. But then, My Lord, how miſerable is the « Condition of the Souls ſuppoſed to be in *Purga-* « *tory*, if they muſt not be deliver'd thence but by « the *Works of Supererogation*, when no Man can be « ſaved by his own Works! *pag.* 187. «

L. What Sr! Are not a Man's own Works conducing to Salvation? Did you not juſt now tell me, that *God will reward every one according to his Works!* Or are not the *Saints*, who are already in Heaven, *rewarded according to their Works?* And is not *Salvation* the *Reward* they have received? If then *Salvation* be a *Reward*, and this Reward is given them for their *Works*, we may in a true Senſe ſay their Works have ſaved them. But if you only mean, that no Man can be ſaved by his own Works *conſider'd nakedly in themſelves*, and *independently* of the *Merits of Chriſt*, I know not any Chriſtian that will oppoſe you.

But pray, Sr, who ever told you, *that the Souls in Purgatory are not to be deliver'd thence but by the Works of Supererogation practiſed by the Saints?* They pray indeed inceſſantly for their ſuffering Brethren. But their Prayers are all offer'd up through the *Mediation* of *Jeſus-Chriſt*, whoſe Treaſure of *infinite Merits* can never be exhauſted; and is a Fund the Souls in *Purgatory* can ſecurely rely upon for their Deliverance from their Pains. So that as long as this ſubſiſts, they can never be deſtitute of the Helps their Condition is capable of. I repeat what I ſaid before, *viz.* that tho the *Saints* have received the full Recompence of all their *Merits*, this hinders not but that the greater their Merits are, the more acceptable to God are their Prayers on the one Hand, and the more available on the other

for the Relief of thoſe, who ſtand in need of them.

» *G.* My Lord, the *Apoſtle* tells us, *we are ſaved* » *not according to our Works, but according to the Grace* » *of God in Chriſt Jeſus.* 2. Tim. 1. ℣. 9. And again, » *Not by the Works of Righteouſneſs, which we have* » *done, but according to his Mercy he has ſaved us* ---- » *through Jeſus-Chriſt our Saviour.* Tit. 3. ℣. 5. 6. *p.* 187. » 188.

L. Sr, you have mangled both the Texts, and omitted that Part which helps to explain them. St *Paul's* Words to *Timothy* are thus. *Who has deliver'd us, and call'd us with an holy Calling not according to our Works, but according to his holy Purpoſe and Grace, which was given us in Chriſt Jeſus before the World began.* Where it is plain he ſpeaks of the Grace of *Predeſtination*, which no Man can merit. His Words to *Titus* are as follow. *But after that the Kindneſs and Love of God our Saviour towards Man appear'd, not by the Works of Righteouſneſs, which we had done, but according to his Mercy he ſaved us by the Waſhing of Regeneration, and Renewing of the holy Ghoſt, which he ſhed on us abundantly through Jeſus-Chriſt our Saviour.* Whence it appears, that St *Paul* ſpeaks here of the *firſt Grace* of *Juſtification* by *Baptiſm*, which likewiſe no Man can Merit.

» *G.* My Lord, we have but one *Saviour*, not » can we be ſaved by the *Merits* of any other. None » other can merit from God. The greateſt *Saint* that » ever was is only ſaved by *Mercy*, and the Forgi- » veneſs of his Sins. Let us therefore not truſt to » the *Supererogated* Works of thoſe, who were not » able to ſave themſelves. *That every Mouth may be* » *ſtopped, and all the World may become guilty before* » *God.* Rom. 3. ℣. 9. *For in his Sight ſhall no Man li-* » *ving be juſtified, there is none righteous, no not one.* » Pſal. 114. ℣. 2. *pag.* 188.

L. Sr, all Men in the World are *Sinners*, which ſuffices to verify the Texts you have quoted. However it is certain there are many in the World free from *mortal Sin*, and theſe are in a State of *Meriting* though the *Grace* and *Merits* of *Jeſus-Chriſt* notwithſtanding their daily Failings.

You ſay, *we have but one Saviour, nor can we be ſaved by the Merits of any other.* Very right Sr, becauſe our own good Works have no *Merit* or *Value*, but what they derive from the *Merits of Chriſt*, which muſt be applied to us to render our Works conducible to Salvation. But God has been pleaſed to eſtabliſh Things upon this Footing, *viz.* that tho he has *redeem'd* us without us, he will not *ſave* us without our *Cooperation*; and Heaven muſt be the *Reward* of our Perſeverance in *good Works*.

You add, *that none but Chriſt can Merit of God.* Sr, none but *Chriſt* can merit *independently* and of himſelf: but *dependently* of him and with the Aſſiſtance of his *holy Grace* all Men can *Merit*: and all that pretend to Salvation, muſt merit it by *good Works*: becauſe *God will reward every Man according to his Works.*

Laſtly you ſay, *the greateſt Saint that ever was is ſaved only by Mercy and the Forgiveneſs of Sins.* Sr, the *Grace of Repentance*, by which we obtain the Forgiveneſs of our Sins is a *pure Mercy*, and all *Merit* is a *Gift of God.* Whence it follows, that tho they who are ſaved are *rewarded according to their Merits*, yet they are ſaved *by Mercy.* And this is entirely conformable to the Doctrine of the *Council of Trent* teaching, *that eternal Life ought to be propoſed both as a Grace mercifully propoſed to the Children of God, and as a Reward Faithfully to be render'd to their good Works and Merits.* Seſſ. 6. C. 16. In Effect, Sr, this whole Diſpute is about a *meer Word*; on which you will

needs faſten a bad Senſe in Spite of our Proteſting continually againſt it, and explaining it in ſuch an orthodox Meaning, as in your Hearts you cannot but allow of.

» *G.* But, My Lord, beſides all I have ſaid, there » are *Degrees of Glory* in Heaven. So that if any could » *ſupererogate*, yet has he nothing to ſpare for others, » becauſe he has received the full of his *Reward* » himſelf. *pag.* 188.

L. Sr, I am glad to hear you ſpeak ſome Senſe at laſt. For if there be *Degrees of Glory* in Heaven, and every Saint has received his *full Reward*, it follows that every Saint has received for Reward a Degree of Glory proportion'd to his *Works* or *Deſerts* in this Life. And do's not that demonſtrate the Doctrine of *Merits*?

» *G.* But, My Lord, this shuts up *Purgatory* for » ever by Exhauſting every Penny of that *Treaſury* » reſerved for their Redemption from thence. *pag.* » 188.

L. I hope, Sr, that as long as the infinite Treaſure of the *Merits* and *Satisfaction* of Chriſt is not exhauſted, there will always be a ſufficient Fund for the Redemption of Souls out of *Purgatory*: and ſo there will be no Danger of it's being *shut up*.

G. But I have another Argument againſt your Doctrine both of *venial Sins* and *Purgatory*. viz. » That the Expectation of having thoſe many Sins » call'd *Venial* with you remitted after Death, do's » naturally make Men more careleſs in their Life. » And truſting to the Merits of others will abate » their Diligence in being *nicely righteous* themſelves. » *pag.* 188.

L. Really, Sr, you make me ſmile. For if Believing a *Purgatory* hinders Men from Endeavouring to be *nicely Righteous*, then I am bound in good Man-

ners to ſuppoſe, that they, who believe no *Purgatory* (and you are one of thoſe) ſtudy to be moſt *nicely righteous*. Well, Sr, I hope at leaſt that truſting in the *Merits of Chriſt* will not abate our Diligence in being *nicely Righteous*.

You ſpeak of *venial Sin*, as if you believed no ſuch Thing. What mean then theſe Words of Sr *James*, *in many Things we all offend?* For I preſume he do's not mean, that *himſelf* and the other *Apoſtles* were guilty of many *mortal Sins*.

But you think *their being remitted after Death makes Men more careleſs in this Life*. Yes, Sr, if they were remitted without Punishment we might grow careleſs of them. But, as you have already deſcribed *Purgatory* for us, viz. *that it is a Place of Fire, where ſouls are put under Pains equal to thoſe of Hell except their Duration*, I think the Temptation to ſlight them is not like to be very great, till Men grow fonder of being burnt, than we yet find they are.

ADVERTISEMENT.

His Lordship *having been ſilent for five whole Pages together in the* former Converſation, *opens his Mouth at Laſt, and out comes this wiſe Saying.* "We find ſome Inſtances among the Fathers of Prayers for the Dead. *To which the* Gentleman *anſwers in the following Manner.*

G. Some *few* among the Fathers you may, but of none in *Scripture*. pag. 188. "

§. 50.

Praying for the Relief of the Dead has been the conſtant Practice of the Catholick Church.

L. BUt is there any Thing in Scripture againſt it? No, you cannot ſo much as ſtrain a Text to make a Flourish with; tho you are as good at it as any Man living. And if there be no Scripture againſt it, it's not being mention'd in Scripture can no more prove it to be no Article of Faith, than it proves the *Validity* of *Infant-baptiſm* to be no Article of Faith; for there is not the leaſt Inſtance or Mention of it in Scripture.

However we read in the Book of *Machabees*, that *Judas Machabeus* ſent to *Jeruſalem* to have Sacrifice offer'd for his dead Soldiers. I know your Church do's not allow that Book to be *Canonical*. But St *Cyprian* call'd them *Divine Scripture*. Epiſt. 55. *ad Corn. Papam.* So did St *Ambroſe* L. 2. *de Jacob. &c.* C. 10. 11. and St *Iſidore* of *Seville*, who writes thus. *Tho the Jews reject the Books of Machabees, yet the Church honours them as divine Books.* L. 6. *Originum.* St *Auſtin* was of the ſame Opinion. *The Church*, ſays he, *reckons them among the canonical Books, tho the Jews do not.* L. 18. de Civit. Dei, C. 36. But his Words L. *de cura pro mortuis* C. 1. are remarkable. *We read*, ſays he, *in the Book of Machabees, that Sacrifice was offer'd for the Dead. But tho this were not to be found in the ancient Scriptures, the Authority of the univerſal Church, which is eminent for this Practice, is of no ſmall Weight.* Here, Sr, you ſee St *Auſtin* inſiſts upon the *publick Practice* of the *univerſal Church* in Offering up Prayers for the Dead. So that you muſt have a good Aſſurance to tell me, that *ſome few* Fathers ſpeak of it, as if the Thing were doubtful.

G. But, My Lord, what were theſe Prayers? « They were for *Peace* and *Reſt* to thoſe, who were « ſuppoſed to be in Peace, yet might receive an « *Encreaſe* of Happineſs even before the Reſurrec- « tion; as ſome ſuppoſe heaven itſelf to conſiſt in « an *eternal encreaſe* of Bliſs. But without this we « may pray for the Continuation of Peace to thoſe « who are in Peace, tho we know it will ſurely be, « as when we pray, *thy Kingdom come, thy will be done:* « we know it muſt be, but this ſhews our Aſſent and « Wiſhes for it. And in this Senſe we alſo pray « for the Dead, that it would pleaſe God *ſhortly to* « *accomplish the Number of the Elect, and to haſten his* « *Kingdom, that we with all thoſe who are departed in* « *the true Faith of his holy Name may have the perfect* « *Conſummation and Bliß both in Body and Soul in his* « *eternal and everlaſting Glory.* And we bleſs him *for* « *all his Servants departed this Life in his Faith and* « *Fear, beſeeching him to give us Grace ſo to follow their* « *good Example, that with them we may be Partakers* « *of his heavenly Kingdom.* So that we pray for them « as well as ourſelves, that we may with them be « Partakers, &c. But neither theſe Prayers of ours, « nor thoſe of the Ancients have any Relation to « *Purgatory*, or Delivering Souls from thence as a « Place of Torments. *pag.* 189. «

L. Sr, I cannot but ſay, the Prayer you have recited is cunningly enough contrived; for it may ſerve either for the *Living* or the *Dead.* However there is one Thing very ſingular in it; *viz.* that (for Example) a *Son*, who go's to his *Father's* Burial thanks God for having taken him out of this Life. Which I think is not very *inſtructive* or *Edifying* But let that be as it will, ſince you own, that you pray for the *Dead* as well as we, I doubt you will find it a hard Task to piece up this *Rag* of

Popery by Saying *that your Prayers have no Relation to Purgatory.* For according to my dull Notion, to pray for others is to beg ſomething they either *want*, or may *loſe*; and to pray that thoſe, who are *ſecure of eternal Reſt*, may continue to have it, is as great a *Soleciſm* as to pray that a Man may continue to be a Man, and a Woman a Woman: or that the *Saints* in Heaven may never be *damn'd.*

As to the two Petitions, you quote from the *Lord's Prayer*, by the firſt we ask to become *Partakers of God's Kingdom*, and by the ſecond that we may always *accompliſh his holy will*, which I think are of the Number of things, we are not ſure of.

But if the Subject of our Prayers for the *Souls departed* be, that they who are in Heaven may receive a *continual Encreaſe of Bliß*, then I preſume the *bleſſed Virgin Mary* is principally remember'd in your good *Proteſtant Prayers.* For no Saint in Heaven deſerves a *continual Encreaſe of Bliß* more than she. And I hope the *Apoſtles* and *Martyrs* will not be forgot. Tho St *Auſtin* was of Opinión that to pray for a *Martyr* was to put an Affront upon him. And indeed I cannot but think that Recommending ourſelves to the Prayers of the *Saints* is far more congruous to good Senſe than Praying for them.

However you have my free Conſent to order your own Prayers as incongruouſly as you pleaſe. But I cannot brook your Drawing the *ancient Fathers* into the ſame Abſurdity by Aſſerting that their Prayers for the Souls departed were only offer'd up *for Peace and Reſt to thoſe, who were ſuppoſed to be in Peace.* This is a bold Contradiction to plain Fact, and obliges me to prove you guilty either of *Ignorance* or *Inſincerity* in Advancing ſo notorious a Falſehood. A few choſen Paſſages of the Fathers will fully make good this Charge againſt you.

Tertullian

Tertullian ſays of a faithful Widow: *ſhe both prays for the Soul of her Husband, and begs a* REFRESHMENT *for him in the mean Time ---- and keeps his Anniverſaries. For unleſs the do's theſe Things, ſhe has repudiated her Husband as far as in her lies.* L. de Monogam. C. 10.

One of *Aerius's* Hereſies in the 4th Century according to St *Epiphanius* was that *the Prayers and Alms of the Living did the Dead no good.* Hær. 75. §. 3. T. 1. *pag.* 908. Againſt whom he writes, that the Church has this *Tradition* from Chriſt, that *Prayers are profitable, tho they do not extinguiſh* ALL SINS. §. 8. *pag.* 912. and that we mention the *Saints* and others in a quite different Manner. *The Saints, that we may give Chriſt a ſingular Honour, and others that we may obtain* MERCY *for them.*

St *Chryſoſtom* writes thus. *The Apoſtles* (ſays he) *did not in vain command theſe Things, that in the venerable and dreadful Myſteries* (that is, the holy *Sacrifice* of the *Maſs*) *the Dead ſhould be remember'd. For they knew they would derive a conſiderable Advantage from it.* Hom. 3. in Epiſt. ad Phil.

And again: *Hom.* 41. in *Epiſt.* 1. *ad Cor.* he writes thus. *The Dead may be help'd by Prayers and Alms and Offerings; becauſe they were not inſtituted in vain.* And concludes, *let us therefore help them. For we have before us the expiatory Sacrifice of the World ---- it may happen that we may obtain* A TOTAL PARDON *for them by Prayers, by Oblations, by the Saints, who are named with them.*

St *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* writes thus. *Laſtly we pray for all that die amongſt us: thinking it to be the greateſt Help that can be to their Souls to have the holy and dreadful Sacrifice of the Altar offer'd in Supplication for them.* Car. Myſtag. 5. *pag.* 241.

We alſo find St *Auſtin* writing in the ſame Manner. *By the Prayers of the holy Church* (ſays he) *and*

the wholesome Sacrifice and Alms it is not to be doubted but the Dead are assisted; so that God deals MORE MERCIFULLY *with them than their Sins have deserved.* Which he proves thus. *Because it is the Practice of the whole Church to offer Sacrifice for them.* But he adds. *These are not beneficial to all the Dead, but only to those, that lived so before their Death, that they might be a Help to them after it. And therefore we do not say the Dead have any new Merits, but that they reap this Fruit from their good Actions before. Serm.* 172. *(olim* 32. *de verbis Apost.)* §. 2.

Here, Sr, we have *Fathers* of the third, fourth, and fifth Century positively Maintaining a *State of Souls* in the other World, wherein they are *refresh'd, help'd, favour'd with the Pardon of some Sins, receiving considerable Advantage, and more mercifully dealt with than their Sins deserved* in Consideration of the *Prayers, Alms*, and *holy Sacrifice of the Altar* offer'd up for them by the Faithful upon Earth: and this is represented by them as a Practice commanded by the *Apostles* themselves. So that I leave any one to Judge, whether any Credit is to be given to what you say, even when you assert Things with the most positive Assurance; as *that there are some few Instances among the Fathers of Prayers for the Dead*; and that *they were only offer'd up for Peace and Rest to those, who were supposed to be in Peace.* Unhappy ignorant People, who are imposed upon and mislead by such faithless and deceitful Guides!

» *G.* My Lord, some of the Ancients had an » Imagination of *purging Fire*, through which Sin- » ners were to pass. But they meant the *general Con-* » *flagration* at the last Day, which comes not at all » to your notion of *Purgatory.* pag. 189. 190.

L. Nor is it any Thing to the Purpose. But did the *Fathers*, I have quoted, when they exhorted the

People to offer up *Prayers*, *Alms*, and the *holy Sacrifice of the Altar* for the Relief of their Friends already deceaſed, did they, I ſay, ſpeak of the *general Conflagration?* Nay do's it not demonſtrate, that they believed there was *then a State*, in which the Souls departed were capable of Receiving *Help*, *Refreſhment*, *the Pardon of ſome Sins*, and (as St *Chryſoſtom* expreſſes it) a *conſiderable Advantage* from them?

§. 51.

Some Remarks upon the Gentleman's *Performance.*

G. MY Lord, I will not trouble you with many Excurſions, or Debating every Branch of theſe Diſputes. I have only given you a *ſummary View of the Heart of the Cauſe* to let you ſee where the matter *pinches*. And indeed my Endeavour with your Lordship is rather to *ſtate the Caſe*, than to *argue upon it*. For *Truth* needs no more than to be fairly ſhew'd; it convinces of itſelf, and beſt when it is *naked* without the *Fucus* of *Philoſophy* and *Diſtinctions*, which are endleſs. Theſe will put a Colour upon *implicit Faith* itſelf, and make you believe you underſtand what you know nothing of. My Lord, give me leave to ſay, your whole Religion is *implicit*, not only as to the particular Points we have diſcourſed; but your whole publick Worship is ſuch, while your Prayers are in a Language not underſtood by the People. How then can they pray with the *Underſtanding*, as the *Apoſtle* requires? 1. *Cor.* 14. *V.* 15. 16. And how can they ſay *Amen?* Seeing they underſtand not what is ſaid. *pag.* 190.

L. I perceive, Sr, we are at Length got out of *Purgatory*, and this fine Speech is only meant as a

Prologue to ſomething elſe. However I ſhall beg leave to make a few Remarks upon it, becauſe it contains ſome ſly Inſinuations, which may eaſily be miſunderſtood. You tell me, *you have only given me a Summary of the Heart of the Cauſe to let me ſee where the Matter pinches: and you have rather ſtated the Caſe than argued upon it.* Very true Sr. For tho you have ſaid much, you have *argued* but little, and *proved* much leſs. Which is perhaps the Reaſon, why I do not ſee *where the Matter Pinches.* However I preſume this is to let me underſtand how favourably I have been uſed, and what a World of fine Things more you could have ſaid upon the ſeveral Subjects we have handled. I aſſure you Sr, I will not be ungrateful, but freely own the Favour you have done me. For I queſtion not, but you might have ſaid a thouſand Things more, full as *pertinent* and *true* as thoſe you have ſaid.

As for Inſtance, inſtead of half a Dozen Texts of *Scripture* at a Time, you might as eaſily have produced a Dozen more, full as much to the Purpoſe: and inſtead of Playing Tricks of Legerdemain with ſome *Fathers* only, you might have cut out for me much more Work by quoting all the reſt with the ſame Sincerity. And your not having given me this Trouble it doubtleſs a Favour I am bound to acknowledge.

You ſay, *truth needs no more than to be fairly ſhewn: it convinces of itſelf, and beſt when it is naked.* This Maxim is very good if meant of *natural Truths* or the *firſt Principles of Reaſon*, which convince of themſelves and are beſt ſeen by their own Light. But I do not ſee how *reveal'd Truths* can come within the Application of this Rule. For I never heard of a Man convinced of the *Myſteries* of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* by the Evidence of theſe Truths; or by

any *Reaſons* that could ſerve as a Light to ſee them by. Theſe therefore, and indeed all other Myſteries, that are above the Reach of our Underſtanding, can be believed no otherwiſe than by *Captivating ourſelves unto the Obedience of Faith.*

But waving this Argument *if Truth needs but to be fairly shew'd to convince*, and *convinces beſt when it is naked*, I muſt conclude that *naked Truth* is either no *Proteſtant* Ware, or you take no Delight to deal in it. For I aſſure you faithfully, there is but one Thing you have convinced me of ſince we converſed together, to wit, that you are no *Papiſt*: For you have not eſtabliſh'd the poſitive Principles of any one particular Religion in the World, nor have you offer'd an Argument of any Note but what would have the ſame Force in the Mouth of an *Anabaptiſt* or *Quaker* as it has in Yours. So that ſuppoſing I were now diſpoſed to abjure *Popery*, you have not furniſh'd me with one ſingle Motive to become a Member of the *Church of England* rather than any other *Proteſtant* Communion. And is it not then pleaſant to hear you talk of nothing but *naked Truths*, of *the Heart of the Cauſe*, of *Shewing where the matter Pinches*, and ſuch other *gaſconading* Stuff! As if every Thing you have ſaid carried *Conviction*, *Evidence*, and *Demonſtration* with it. Whereas I have ſcarce had any other Buſineſs upon my Hands than to rectify Miſtakes or wilful Miſrepreſentations of our Doctrine: to be upon my Guard againſt the moſt ſtudied and impoſing Sophiſtry, to confute bold Calumnies and Falſehoods, and deliver both *Fathers* and *Scriptures* from the Torture. This, Sr, is a faithful Summary of the *naked Truths* I have had to deal with: This is your Method of Shewing *the Heart of the Cauſe* and where the matter *Pinches*.

I need not ſay any Thing to the paſſing Flirt;

you had just now at *implicit Faith*; of which I have said enough in our Dispute concerning *Transubstantiation* [2. p. §. 31.] where I shew'd our Faith to be no more *implicit* than St *Peter's* was, when he said to Christ, *thou hast the Words of eternal Life and we believe, &c.* Joh. 6. ℣. 68. or than your Faith is when you believe the *whole Bible*, a considerable Part whereof you neither know nor understand.

§. 52.

Of the Liturgy in Latin.

LEt us therefore now come to the trivial Question about our *Liturgy*, the Mention whereof has made you just now say, that *our whole Religion is implicit.* But I see no great Occasion for *implicit Faith* to approve of the Church's Discipline in Saying *Mass in Latin.*

1. There is no Need of *implicit Faith* to believe, that the common People (of *England*, for Example) understand *English*, into which the *Mass* is translated as it is into other Languages.

2. There is no Need of *implicit Faith* to believe the common People have Eyes and can see. Now the *Mass* being a *Sacrifice* is more an *Action* than Prayer: And Actions are known by *seeing* as Words are by *Hearing.* In Effect, the People know that our Saviour's sacred *Body* and *Blood* are offer'd up in the *Mass*; and if they can but bring their Hearts fill'd with *Faith*, *Hope*, *Love*, *Repentance*, *Thanksgiving*, and other such Acts of Devotion, they cannot fail of receiving the Benefit of this holy Sacrifice.

It was God's Command Lev. 16. ℣. 17. that the People should not be in the Tabernacle, when the

Prieſt went in to make *an Atonement for all the Congregation of Iſrael.* And in the Goſpel we find *the whole Multitude of the People praying without in the Time of the Incenſe.* Luke 1. ℣. 10. Yet this was a publick Prayer and *Liturgy* of God's own Appointment. Whence I conclude, that there is no Need of implicit Faith to believe, that the People may *join in Prayer* with the Prieſt, tho their Prayer be not the ſame as his.

3. There is no Need of *implicit Faith* to believe, that the *Catholick Church* profeſs'd in the *Creed* was by God's Help and the Experience of about 900 Years wiſe enough to know what Language *Maß* was to be ſaid in.

4. There is no Need of *implicit Faith* to believe, that nothing could be more abſurd in the *firſt Reformers*, than to make that a Pretence of Breaking Communion with their *Mother-Church.* And

5. There is no Need of *implicit Faith* to believe, that the Deſire of the Heart is the principal Prayer: whence it follows that he, who in his Heart begs of God whatever is contain'd in the Prayer he recites, tho he do's not underſtand it, prays as truly as another that underſtands it.

Theſe, Sr, are the Preliminaries I inſiſt upon in this weighty Diſpute, and of which I will not bate you an Ace: becauſe they are *naked Truths without the Fucus of Philoſophy or Diſtinctions, and convince of themſelves.* Now then you may put what Objections you pleaſe.

G. My Lord, the People's ſaying their own pri- «
vate Prayers is not *joining* with the Prieſt. *p.* 190. «

L. No Sr? Then the People's *Praying without in the Time of the Incenſe* Luke 1. ℣. 10. was much leſs joining with the Prieſt. For they could not even ſee him in the *Tabernacle*: whereas ours ſee him at

the *Altar* Offering the *Sacrifice*. What then should hinder them from Offering it up jointly with him?

» *G.* They cannot ſay *Amen* to his Prayers. What » then have they to do in the Church? For this is » not *Communion*. pag. 191.

L. Is it not So? I think joining Prayers together is Communion: and that is preciſely the Buſineſs they have to do in the Church. But I cannot forbear Similing at your exceſſive Scrupuloſity. You ſay *the People cannot ſay* Amen *to the Prayers of the Prieſt*. Pray, what should hinder them? Do they fear he is *Curſing* them, or Conjuring up ſome *evil Spirit*? Do they not know he is Praying for them? And why then should they ſcruple to ſay *Amen* to his Prayers?

» *G.* All he do's is purely *implicit*, and nothing elſe » but *opus operatum*. pag. 191.

L. Really, Sr, this *implicit*, and *opus operatum* run away ſo entirely with your Reaſon and Judgment, that they make you forget to ſpeak common Senſe.

» *G.* My Lord, A *Liturgy* in a Tongue unknown » to the People is an Invention without Precedent. » For it never enter'd into the Head of *Man* or » *Church* ſince the Creation, except only in the » *Church of Rome*: and of which the *Apoſtle* gives this » Character, *will they not ſay ye are mad?* 1. Cor. » 14. ℣. 16. 17. *pag.* 191.

L. Sr, turn the Queſtion homewards, and I will not ſcruple to reſolve it in the *Affirmative*. For nothing but one Labouring under a more than ordinary *Delirium* can be capable of Aſſerting as you do, *that a Liturgy in a Tongue not known to the People is an Invention without Precedent, and never enter'd into the Head of Man or Church ſince the Creation, except only the Church of Rome.* This I preſume Sr, is one of your *naked Truths, which convince of themſelves.*

But

But the learned Dr *Walton* in the *Prolegomena* upon his *Polyglot* will inform you better, and let you know, *firſt*, that whole Churches in the *Eaſt* have this Cuſtom. *So that* (ſays he) *the common People do not underſtand the Liturgies of Baſil and Chryſoſtom, which are read publickly in the Churches.* C. 5. §. 1, 16. and *2dly*, that not only *Chriſtians*, but *Jews* and *Mahometans* have the ſame Cuſtom in the Eaſt. *Officia divina linguis non vulgaribus hodie celebrantur apud Judæos, Chriſtianos, & Mahumedanos.* C. 5. §. 3. ſee alſo Cap. 13. §. 18.

Mr *Brerewood* another *Proteſtant* Author in his *Enquiries* Chap. 2. pag. 12. agrees exactly with Dr *Walton*. For ſpeaking of the *Greek Church*, *the Difference* (ſays he) *is become ſo great between the preſent and the ancient Greek, that their Liturgy yet read in the ancient Greek Tongue, namely, that of Baſil on the Sabbaths and ſolemn Days, and that of Chryſoſtom on common Days is not underſtood, or but little of it by the Vulgar People.*

Monſ. *Tavernier* tells us of the *Neſtorians*, p. 69. that they perform the Divine Office in the *Chaldaick*: to which the learned Author of *the Guide in Controverſies* adds, pag. 289. that *Divine Service* is celebrated in the corrupt *Chaldaick* or *Syriack* amongſt the *Maronites*, *Cophtes*, *Neſtorians*, *Aſſyrians* or *Jacobites*: and in the *Greek* amongſt the *Melchites* and *Georgians*: the *Vulgar* to all theſe being the *Arabick*; or to ſome more *Eaſterly* the *Perſian Tongue*.

But to come nearer Home, Dr *Heylin* tells us in his Hiſtory of the *Reformation* p. 128. That in Queen *Elizabeth's* Time *the Irish Parliament paſs'd an Act for Uniformity in Common Prayer with Permiſſion of Saying the ſame in Latin, where the Miniſter had not the knowledge of the English Tongue. But for Tranſlating it into Irish there was no Care taken. The People were required*

by that Statute under ſeveral Penalties to frequent their Churches, and to be preſent at the Reading of the English Liturgy, which they underſtood no more than they do the Maß.

Now, Sr, if you had lived in Queen *Elizabeth's* Days, I doubt whether your zeal would have carried you ſo far, as to have addreſs'd her thus in St *Paul's* Words; *will they not ſay you are Mad* for Paſſing ſuch an Act, and furniſhing the *Papiſts* with Stones to throw back at us?

But ſince you aſſert, *it never enter'd into the Head of Man, &c. Martin Luther*, Sr, as great a Man as he was (for he was certainly a *Man*) did not think it abſurd to have the *Liturgy* in *Latin*. For in the firſt Part of his Book writ againſt *Carloſtadius* and the *Fanaticks* Ann. 1525. (*apud Hoſpin.*) he grants *firſt*, that the Name of *Maß* may ſtill be kept; and *2dly*, that it is an indifferent Thing, whether it be ſaid in a *foreign* or the *Vulgar* Tongue. And pray Sr, what will all Men of knowledge and Sincerity now think of your noble Aſſertion, that a *Liturgy in a Tongue unknown to the People is an Invention without Precedent!* and *that it never enter'd into the Head of Man or Church ſince the Creation, except only in the Church of Rome!* Sr, to return your own Compliment in St *Paul's* Words, *will they not ſay you are Mad?*

I add, that in the primitive Ages the *Liturgy* was perform'd in the ſame Language it is now both in the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Churches; and if our *Liturgy* be not as commonly underſtood now as it was formerly, 'tis not becauſe the Church has made any Alteration in it's former Language, or deſires that her *publick Service* ſhould not be underſtood by the common People; but becauſe all *Vulgar Tongues* are ſubject to perpetual Changes; as is manifeſt from

the Difference there is between our *modern English*, and what was ſpoken in the Days of *Chaucer*. So that if every Nation had laid aſide the *Latin*, and perform'd the *Liturgy* in it's own Language, the publick Service of every National Church muſt have undergone as many Changes as there have been in thoſe Languages. Beſides that ſuch *Prieſts* and *Biſhops*, as are obliged to travel abroad, would have been render'd utterly incapable by it of Performing their Functions in foreign Countries; which is a very conſiderable Inconvenience, and was doubtleſs a Conſideration of Weight to induce the *Weſtern* Church to adhere to the *ancient Latin*, and the *Greek* Church to their ancient *Greek* in their publick Service, rather than ſuffer any Innovation to be made in it.

But I cannot Imagine, what Reaſon you ſhould have to quote the 14th Chapter of St *Paul* to the *Corinthians* unleſs it be becauſe it is nothing to the Purpoſe. For our Diſpute is about the *Liturgy*, that is, the *publick Office* eſtabliſh'd by the Church; and St *Paul* ſpeaks not a Word in the whole Chapter of any Thing like a *Liturgy*, or *publick Office*, or *ſet Form* of Prayers, but only of ſudden extemporary Exhortations and Prayers, which even Laypersons by a miraculous Gift of unknown Tongues utter'd to the People in publick Aſſemblies, but many Times without any *Interpretation* of what they ſaid. And this St *Paul* diſapproves of, and cenſures in that Chapter particularly ℣. 11. 16, 17.

G. But, My Lord, his Arguments are of equal Force againſt your Practice. For his Reaſons againſt it are *firſt*, becauſe the unlearned cannot ſay *Amen* to Prayers they do not underſtand. ℣. 16. and *2dly*, becauſe they cannot be *edified* by Exhortations and Prayers in a foreign Tongue. ℣. 17.

L. Very right, Sr, if there be not an *Interpreter* to explain them: which is the very Suppoſition, upon which the *Apoſtle's* Arguments are grounded. But is that our Caſe? You muſt ſhut both your Eyes to ſee no Difference. For, *firſt*, the common People can *ſee* as well as Schollars; and when they are once taught what every Part of the *Maß* means, they can never want *Interpreters* as long as they can ſee. But *2dly*, the Tranſlation of the *Maß*, as likewiſe of *Veſpers*, *Litanies*, *Hymns* and *Prayers* into the vulgar Languages of every Country is I think a very good *Interpretation* of them, and takes away all the weighty Scruples of Saying *Amen*. I add, that in Relation to the *publick Office*, or any *ſet Form* of Prayers ordain'd by the Church, no Man ſurely in his right Senſes can heſitate to ſay *Amen* to it, tho he underſtands not a Word of it, for the Reaſons already given.

Now ſince St *Paul* ſpeaks not of any *publick Office*, or *ſet Form* of Prayers ordain'd by the Church, but only of extemporary Prayers or Exhortations pronounced by private Perſons in a *Tongue unknown*, and without any *Interpreter* to explain them, nothing can be wider from the Purpoſe, than to object his Words againſt our *Liturgy* in *Latin*. But a weak Cauſe can have nothing but weak Arguments to ſupport it.

» *G.* I muſt own, My Lord, your Doctrine ſuits » well with what *Suarez* ſays (de Orat. L. 3. C. 14.) » *that it is not neceſſary to Prayer, that the Perſon* » *Praying ſhould think of what he ſpeaks.* This is *opus* » *operatum* with a Witneſs; and a *Parrot* may be » taught thus to pray. And how do they pray with » the Prieſt, who are Talking of Buſineſs, or Chat- » ting of News, whilſt he is Offering up their » Prayers to God in a Language, of which they do

not underſtand one Word, and therefore cannot give Attention to it? And theſe are the greateſt Number, *viz.* of the common People, who cannot read, and ſo cannot carry private Books of Devotion with them. Tho if they did, it would not be joining with the Prieſt, nor could theſe be call'd *common Prayer*, which are offer'd up *with one Accord*, purſuant to Saint *Chryſoſtom's* Prayer, with which our daily publick Prayers do conclude. *pag.* 191.

L. Sr, tho a Man were both *Deaf* and *Blind*, and could ſay nothing but the *Lord's Prayer*, yet the conſtant Repeating of that Prayer in *Union* with the Prayers of the Congregation is truly Praying *with one Accord* in the Judgment of any Man, that has not abjured common Senſe; For 'tis the Prayer of the Heart, that God regards, and the Heart of ſuch a one is as much United in Devotion with the whole Aſſembly, as if he repeated the ſame Prayers litterally with them. This, Sr, anſwers your curious Obſervation concerning thoſe in our Communion who cannot read; whom by an *Hyperbole* of a more than ordinary Size you have render'd at leaſt fifty to one more numerous than they really are.

As to what you have quoted from *Suarez*, I may reaſonably preſume his meaning is either; that *involuntary* Diſſipations of the Mind (during which no Man *thinks of what he ſpeaks*) do not hinder the Effect or Fruit of Prayer; and this is the Doctrine of all ſpiritual Writers; or that the *Mind may be raiſed to God*, and by Conſequence perform the eſſential Duty of Prayer, without an actual Attention to the Words that are pronounced. And do's this deſerve to be ridiculed with your ſenſeleſs common Topic of *opus Operatum*? Is this Praying like a *Parrot*, or like thoſe, who are *Talking of Buſineſs*, *or Chatting*

of News, who only deſerve to be driven out of the Church? However I ſuppoſe you intended this for a charitable Inſinuation to all good *Proteſtants*, that this is the common Way of Praying amongſt *Papiſts*: for which I return you my moſt hearty Thanks; and ſo take my Leave of you, ſince we have now gone through all the Points diſputed between the two Churches.

G. I hope, My Lord, we ſhall one Day meet together in the *Unity of Faith.*

L. I heartily wish the ſame. But then it muſt be in the *Faith* of that *One, Holy, Catholick, and Apoſtolick Church*: which St *Paul* calls *the Pillar and Ground of Truth.* 1. Tim. 3. ℣. 15. to which Chriſt has promiſed his *perpetual Aſſiſtance.* Math. 28. ℣. 20. and againſt which *the Gates of Hell will never prevail.* Math. 16. ℣. 16. For this is the Church eſtabliſh'd by Chriſt to be our *Guide* to *Heaven*; and he, who will not follow this Guide, runs into everlaſting Perdition, and will have his Portion with *Heathens* and *Publicans.* Math. 18. ℣. 17.

FINIS.

THE POSTSCRIPT.

CONTAINING SOME REMARKS upon the *Gentleman's* Concluſion in the *former Converſation.*

HAVING follow'd the *Gentleman* Step by Step for a hundred and ninety one Pages, I did not think my ſelf bound to continue the Converſation any longer. For the Diſpute in the *Gentleman's Caſe ſtated* ends page 191. and the twenty laſt Pages contain little more than a Recapitulation of what he has ſaid againſt the *Pope's Supremacy*, the *Church's Unity*, and in Defence of *private Judgment* againſt the Authority of the *Church*. To ſpeak properly, the main Subject of thoſe twenty Pages is a triumphant Recital of the great Feats the *Gentleman* has done. He appears big with the Succeſs of his Performance, and gives himſelf the Airs of a Conqueror returning loaden with the Spoils of a Vanquish'd Foe: whilſt his *Lordſhip* is remarkable for nothing but his *ſtupid Silence*, and might, for ought I know, have been condemn'd to be preſs'd to Death for a *Mute*, were it not for about half a Dozen Lines of Nonſenſe utter'd by him in the whole twenty Pages. I may indeed juſtly compare him to a Criminal conſcious of his Guilt, ſtanding at the Bar with Eyes caſt down to the Ground, whilſt the Judge is Summing up the Evidence againſt him, and giving Directions to the jury to bring in their

Verdict. Nay we have nothing leſs than the *Gentleman's* own Word to aſſure us (and the Word of a *Gentleman* will ſurely not be queſtion'd) that he has all the *Fathers* on his Side againſt the *Pope's Supremacy*, and all the Reaſon in the World on his Side againſt ſubmitting to the *Authority* of the *Church*. He reminds his *Lordſhip* of his having proved *this* and *that*, and the Lord knows what. He has *put ſuch a Thing out of all Diſpute*; and *made other Things plain to a Demonſtration*. And what then had his *Lordſhip* elſe to do but to ſubmit to his hard Fate with a *reſpectful Silence!* I ſhall however venture to make ſome Remarks upon this Piece, which the *Gentleman* introduces in the following Manner. *And now, My Lord, upon the whole, if the Advantage do's not ſeem to your Lordſhip to lye on our Side in all the particulars before mention'd, yet can you have any Doubt of the Safety of your Soul in our Way? Since all our Danger is in Omitting ſome Things that might be profitable, but cannot be call'd neceſſary. Wherein if the Error lies of your Side, you are involved in manifold Superſtitions, and of Adding to, and ſubſtracting from the Word of God.* p. 191, 192.

Here the *Gentleman* either ſpeaks of *Particulars* relating to *Faith*, or *Diſcipline* only (for he is a great Dealer in *double Meanings*) if he ſpeaks of the former, his Queſtion *how his Lordſhip can have any Doubt of the Safety of his Soul in the Proteſtant Way*, anſwers itſelf. Becauſe his *Lordſhip* has already inform'd him, that the Belief of *all Articles of Faith* is neceſſary to Salvation, when they are duly propoſed by the *Church*. And he is ſure that many of the Articles denied by the *Gentleman* are of this Nature.

But if he ſpeaks of Matters of *Diſcipline* only, tho they be not in themſelves *neceſſary to Salvation*, yet

yet *Obedience* to the Commands of the Church even in Things that are of themselves indifferent is necessary to Salvation, as his *Lordship* has fully shew'd in his Answer to the *Gentleman's* preliminary Questions in the *Introduction*.

Let us suppose a *Puritan* should argue thus against the *Gentleman* in his own Language. *Baptizing with the Sign of the Cross, Using the Common Prayer-book, and keeping holy Days for Saints and Angels, &c. may be profitable, but cannot be call'd necessary: whereas if the Error lies on your Side, you are involved in manifold Superstitions, by Adding to the Word of God.* Suppose, I say, a *Puritan* should argue thus against the *Gentleman*, he would either be put to a Non-plus, or forced to give him this *Popish* Answer; *that the Church is wise enough to regulate her own Discipline. That her Children are bound in Conscience to conform to it. That Schism is a most grevious Sin, and to break Communion under Pretence of Understanding Scriptures better than the Church is but Adding Presumption to Disobedience.* This I think would be a solid Answer to the *Puritan*, and the *Gentleman* is desired to accept of this Answer as abundantly sufficient for all Objections he can make against *Communion in one kind*, the *Liturgy in Latin*, the *single Life of the Clergy*, the *Use of Images* in our Churches, of the *Sign of the Cross*, of *holy Water*, *Benedictions*, *&c.* All these being purely Matters of *Discipline*.

But suppose an *Arian* should take the Advantage of the *Gentleman's* Argument, and retort it thus upon him. *All our Danger is in Omitting* Consubstantiality, *the Belief whereof is not necessary. Whereas if the Error lies on your Side, you are involved in manifest Blasphemy and Idolatry.* I leave the *Gentleman* to consider, what Answer he would give; and whether his Answer would not be a Cap to fit his own Block.

Of Supremacy.

THe two next Pages after the *Gentleman's* laſt Words quoted by me contain nothing but a Repetition of Objections againſt the *Pope's Supremacy* already anſwer'd in our Diſpute upon that Subject: after which he continues thus. *No Kingdom of the Earth will content him. He will be univerſal Monarch of the whole World. And why ſo?* pag. 194.

In good Truth I cannot tell. For I cannot give a good Reaſon for a *Chimera*. And I dare ſwear the Pope himſelf knows nothing of the matter. But the Gentleman knows better Things, and anſwers the Queſtion thus for the Pope. *Becauſe Chriſt is the Head of all Churches, and therefore muſt have an univerſal Vicar.* This the *Gentleman* will needs have to be the Reaſon, why the *Pope*, as he tells us, pretends to be *univerſal Monarch of the whole World.* And I cannot but ſay, the Reaſon is as nonſenſical as the *Chimera*, that is built upon it. But as the ſame *Art Magick*, which conjures up *Spirits*, can conjure them down again; ſo the *Gentleman* ſhews he can as eaſily confute *Chimeras*, as invent them: which he has done with great Skill by Saying, *that from the ſame Parity of Reaſon it would follow, that becauſe God is the King of all the Earth, therefore he muſt have an univerſal Vicar in Temporals.* I allow the Parity to be good, and the aforeſaid wiſe Reaſon fully confuted by it.

But I ſhall give him another Reaſon for the Pope's *Supremacy* (by whatever ridiculous name he is pleaſed to call it) which I hope will not be ſo eaſily confuted. It is grounded upon three plain Facts. 1. That Chriſt gave to St *Peter* by a *ſpecial Commiſſion* the Government of his *whole Flock*. 2. That this

Power of Governing his whole Flock was not to die with St *Peter*, but like *Epiſcopacy* and *Prieſthood* continue in his Church for ever by Paſſing to his Succeſſors. And 3. That the Succeſſors of St *Peter* have always been Bishops of *Rome*, whom we call *Popes* in our Language. The two firſt are of *Divine Inſtitution*, and all three are as inconteſtable, as that the *See* of *Canterbury* is the Eccleſiaſtical *Metropolis* of *England*. At leaſt I flatter myſelf they will appear ſo to any unbiaſs'd Reader, who will but give himſelf the Trouble to peruſe, what his *Lordship* has ſaid in Defence of the *Supremacy*, 1. p. §. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. and 55. of the ſame Part.

Nor can I ſee how the *Gentleman* and his *Proteſtant* Brethren will eſcape being convicted of *Hereſy* and *Schiſm* by his own Confeſſion, ſince he tells us pag. 194. 195. *That they will own themſelves Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, and pay their Obedience to the Pope, if it can be ſhew'd that Chriſt has appointed an univerſal Vicar in his Church*: unleſs by *univerſal Vicar* he means a great Deal more than we do, and then he fights againſt his own Shadow. For we mean no more than that St *Peter* was, and his *Succeſſor* is next under *Chriſt* the *ſupreme Head* or *Governour* of his Church in *Spirituals*. And he who cannot find this in the Text of St *Mathew* 16. ℣. 18. And St *John* 21. ℣. 15. where all Antiquity clearly found it, is wilfully blind.

I therefore cannot doubt but the Reader will be extremely ſurprized at the *Gentleman's* exorbitant *Rhodomontado* pag. 195. where he ſpeaks thus. *We are verily perſuaded, that there is not the leaſt Ground for this univerſal Supremacy either in holy Scriptures, or in Antiquity, or in the Reaſon of the Thing, or in Fact ſince the firſt Foundation of Chriſtianity to this Day, or that it ever was acknowledg'd, or is now by the Majority of*

Chriſtian Churches. Was there ever ſuch a Complication of Falſehoods utter'd with ſuch a confident Air! What! Not the *leaſt Ground* for the Supremacy either in *Scriptures*, or *Antiquity*, or *Reaſon*, or *Fact* from the firſt Foundation of Chriſtianity to this Day! And is the *Gentleman* verily perſuaded of this! Then he muſt be verily perſuaded, that the whole Iſland of *Great Britain* (for it's Share alone) was Mad for nine hundred Years together: ſince it acknowledg'd (as he owns himſelf *Caſe ſtated* p. 108.) the Pope's *ſpiritual Supremacy* for ſo many Ages: which none but a People void of Senſe would have done upon a Principle of Conſcience, if there were not *the leaſt Ground for it either in Scriptures, or Antiquity, or Reaſon, or Fact from the firſt Foundation of Chriſtianity*, as the *Gentleman* has the Aſſurance to tell us. But when he wrote this he was ſole maſter of the Field. His *Lordſhip* was under *Tutelage*, and could not contradict his *Tutor* without his Allowance, who took effectual Care to tie up his Tongue, and doubted not but any *Tale of a Tub* would paſs for current Truth with the Bubbles he chiefly wrote for. And this he calls *Stating the Caſe*. But I hope the Caſe of *Supremacy* is ſomewhat more fairly ſtated by his *Lordſhip* in the ſeveral *Sections*, to which I have juſt now refer'd the Reader. And as to what the *Gentleman* ſays, that *the Supremacy never was acknowledg'd by the Majority of Chriſtian Churches*, the Reader is deſired to turn back to §. 16. 17. of the *firſt Part*, where he will be fully convinced of the notorious Falſehood of this Aſſertion.

Page 195. 196. the *Gentleman* entertains us with a fine Flourish upon the Inconvenience of *Appeals* to *Rome*, where he ſays *Cauſes laſt from Age to Age*. This (ſays he) *made the Reformation even neceſſary for the Preſervation of the People as well Laity as Clergy*, who

groan'd under the Burden, which neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear. However I muſt take the Liberty to tell the *Gentleman*, that *England* was as flouriſhing a Kingdom, and the People both *Laity* and *Clergy* lived as comfortably under the Pope's *ſpiritual Supremacy*, as they have done ſince it was thrown off. But let that be as it will; are there no Ways and Means to put a Stop to Abuſes without Affronting, or pulling down the Authority, that commits them? Are there not Lawſuits in *Great Britain* entail'd upon Families from Generation to Generation? And muſt we then conclude, that the *Courts of Chancery* and other *Courts of Judicature* ought to be ſuppreſs'd, becauſe frequent Abuſes are committed in them? Nay I fear the *Supreme Tribunal* itſelf which is the *Bulwark* of the *Engliſh Liberties*, will not be ſecure againſt the deſtructive Force of this *Logick*.

But the *Gentleman's* Argument ſtrikes yet much deeper: for the Queſtion between us is preciſely; whether the Pope's *Supremacy* be of *Divine Inſtitution?* We maintain it is; and 'tis his Buſineſs to diſprove it. Now I appeal to any Man, whether *real* or *ſuppoſed Abuſes* of any *Authority* be an Argument of any Force to prove it not to be of *Divine Inſtitution?* If not, all Arguing againſt it from ſuch Abuſes is wholly frivolous. But if it be a ſolid Argument, and if it be true that ſuch Abuſes (as the *Gentleman* tell us) *make a Reformation* which annuls that Inſtitution *neceſſary*, then the *bleſſed Sacrament*, which is abuſed by Thouſands to their own Damnation, is the firſt Thing that ought to be *reform'd away*, and diſcarded as well as the *Pope's Supremacy*.

But beſides all this, what a frightful Liſt of enormous Abuſes committed by *ſecular Magiſtrates* and *Parents* in Relation to their *Subjects* and *Children*

might a Man produce, if it were worth his Pains? And would this be a good Argument to prove that their Power and Authority is not of God, or that a *Reformation* is neceſſary to abolish all Power upon Earth? Thus the *Gentleman's* Arguing from real or ſuppoſed Abuſes of the *Pope's Supremacy* to juſtify an abſolute Denial or Abolishing of it, would make one ſuſpect him to be neither *Divine*, nor a *good Chriſtian*, nor *good Subject*. For it plainly tends to ſubvert the Inſtitutions of God, and cuts down all *Power* Root and Branch: ſince all theſe are liable to be abuſed.

I come now to a Piece of Slander, which for it's Boldneſs is hard to be match'd. It is worded thus, *pag.* 197. 198. *The Pope's Supremacy* (upon which the Diſcourſe runs) *is the only Article in your Creed* (ſpeaking to his *Lordship*) *to be believed explicity. As for others, implicit will do for them all. That is, it is no Matter, whether you believe them or not: ſo the Sovereignty of the univerſal Biſhop be maintain'd inviolably.* I cannot imagine what the *Gentleman* propoſed to himſelf, when he wrote this extraordinary Piece. Was he aſleep or awake? Or was his Head ſeiz'd with a Fit of the Gout, which hinder'd him from Thinking? Could he imagine that any Man of Senſe in the World would believe him? Or did he think his Reputation ſo well eſtabliſh'd, that if he ſhould tell People, that *Light* is *Darkneſs*, they would take it for a Truth upon his bare Word?

Surely the *Gentleman's* Overſhooting himſelf in ſo exorbitant a Manner muſt be attributed to ſome ſuch Cauſe. He ſays *the Pope's Supremacy is the only Article we are bound to believe explicitly; as to others, it is no Matter, whether we believe them or not.* What, is it no Matter with us, whether we do or do not believe in *God the Father*, or in *Jeſus Chriſt his only*

Son? Is it no Matter with us whether we do or do not believe the *bleſſed Trinity*, or the *Incarnation*, *Death*, and *Reſurrection* of our Saviour Chriſt? Why then do we teach Children the *Apoſtles Creed* as ſoon as they can ſpeak, and tell them they muſt believe every Article of it under Pain of eternal Damnation, if it be no Matter whether they believe it or not? But the Calumny is too groſs to deſerve a ſerious Anſwer.

Page 198. the *Gentleman* tells us, *there never was a Church call'd Catholick in the Senſe of Rome; that is, which was own'd by all other Churches as their Head.* If he means, which was own'd by *Heretieks* and *Schiſmaticks*; I grant there never was ſuch a *Catholick Church.* But where will he find this to be the *Senſe of Rome?* When did the *Church of Rome* pretend to be a ridiculous Compound of all Sects? Or declare, either that the *Catholick Church* was ever own'd by *Heretical* or *Schiſmatical* Churches, or that she ever own'd them as a Part of her Communion? The *Gentleman* forgot here what he ſaid before, viz. *that the Church of Rome by her Principles cannot communicate with any, who will not own her Supremacy.* Which utterly ſpoils his pretty Compariſon of the *Church of Rome* to the Bed of *Procruſtes*, to which ſome were made fit by being ſtretch'd out, and others by being cut ſhorter. For I do not ſee by what Contrivance either of *Cutting off*, or *Stretching out* he will ever make *Hereticks*, *Schiſmaticks*, or Perſons *really excommunicated* become Members of the *Church of Rome*: And if he do's not, his Compariſon is void of Senſe.

Of Unity.

PAge 199. the *Gentleman* begins to ſpeak of *Unity*, and accuſes us *firſt* of not having *Unity of Faith*:

But how do's he prove it? He tells us *firſt*, we know not *where to place the Infallibility*. Tis very true his *Lordſhip* in the former Converſation knew no more than the *Gentleman* would let him: but he has now fully ſatisfied him in that Point, and mark'd out very plainly to him, where it is to be placed [1. Part. §. 52.] But *2dly*, he ſays, *we do not agree, which Articles of our Creed are to be believed explicitly.* Yet he told us Juſt now, that *the Pope's Supremacy is the only Article in our Creed to be believed explicitly.* How neceſſary is it for ſome Perſons to have good Memories?

However to ſatisfy him as far as is neceſſary; we teach unanimouſly, that all are bound to do what they can to learn the *Apoſtle's Creed*, and have it explain'd to them; and then they are bound to believe every Article *explicitly*. Nor do I know any Writer, that excuſes any one come to the Uſe of Reaſon from the Neceſſity of Believing *explicitly*, that there is *one God in three Perſons*: that the *ſecond Perſon became Man and died for us*: and that God is the *Rewarder of Virtue*, and *Puniſher of Sin*. But over and above, we oblige them to believe in General all Truths reveal'd to the *Catholick Church*: which I think ſuffices to a perfect *Unity in Faith*. For otherwiſe whoever has not an *explicit* knowledge of all Truths whatſoever contain'd in the *whole Bible*, cannot be ſaid to have an *entire Faith*, which is abſurd. And the Abſurdity of it ſhews, that the *Gentleman* himſelf as great an Enemy as he is to Believing *implicitly*, muſt ſit down content with an *implicit Faith* of numberleſs reveal'd Truths.

But *2dly*, he taxes us page 200. with Want of *Unity* in *Love* and *Charity*: and proves it becauſe there are *Diſputes among Religious Orders*, and between *National and National Churches*. Whence he concludes,

cludes, *that Unity in outward Communion will avail us nothing, nay it will not ſo much as denominate us Chriſtians, far leſs to be the only Chriſtians in the World, or the Catholick Church.*

What a Number of Miſtakes are here to be rectified? *First*, he ſuppoſes that Diſputes about private Opinions muſt of Neceſſity cauſe a Breach of *Love* and *Charity*: which is a groſs Miſtake. For the *Apoſtles* themſelves were not free from Diſputes, yet I hope they were in Charity with one another. *2dly*, he ſuppoſes that our *Unity* conſiſts meerly in an *outward Communion*; which is a groſſer Miſtake than the former. Becauſe *inward Faith* is ſomewhat more than a meer *outward Communion*: and we admit none into the Church but ſuch as declare they believe truly and ſincerely the *whole Faith* reveal'd by God. *3dly*, he ſuppoſes a Church to be *unchriſtian'd* (if I may be allow'd to ſpeak ſo) by ſome of her Members being void of *Love* and *Charity* to one another. Which if it be true, there will not be ſuch a Thing as a *Chriſtian Church* in the World. But *4thly*, he ſuppoſes we think ourſelves the *only Chriſtians in the World*; which is a downright Blunder. But to ſtave off from himſelf the imputation of it, and be at full Liberty to confute it, he fathers it upon his *Lordſhip* in the *two Lines* of *Nonſenſe* attributed to him *pag.* 198. where the noble Peer after a long Silence comes out with this wiſe Saying, *But we admit none others to be Chriſtian Churches, who do not own it* (meaning the *Supremacy*) which is both falſe and abſurd. For, tho it be true that we eſteem ourſelves the *only Catholicks* in the World, becauſe the *Catholick Church* is eſſentially *One*, that is, in *One Communion* (or the *Nicene Creed* is falſe) yet we are far from Eſteeming ourſelves to be the *only Chriſtians* in the World; And ſo we own that *Hereticks* and

Schiſmaticks baptized and believing the Divinity of Chriſt are *Chriſtians*; yet we deny them to be *Catholicks*. As I own the *Gentleman* to be a *Chriſtian*, but I will never own him to be a *Catholick*, unleſs he renounces his Errors.

Here then let us ſee, what Account the *Gentleman* gives of the *Church's Unity*. He diſtinguiſhes between a *perfect Unity*, and ſuch a one as we are capable of in this our imperfect State. *Perfect Unity* (ſays he *pag.* 199.) *is not only in outward Communion, that is, in being within the ſame Walls together, or in Subſcribing to a Formula of Articles of Faith, half of which muſt be believed implicitly; but an Unity likewiſe in Saving and Damning Principles, and Practices of Love and Charity, for which chiefly we ſhall be Judg'd at the laſt Day. If theſe be wanting the Unity will be very imperfect, and ſtand us in little Steed.*

If by theſe laſt Words the *Gentleman* means no more, than that an *outward Communion*, and *Profeſſion of the ſame Faith* ſuffices not to ſave the Members of that Communion, unleſs they be likewiſe united in *Love* and *Charity*, I am wholly of his Mind: becauſe *Faith alone* or being a Member of the true Church ſuffices not to Salvation without the Obſervance of the *Commandements:* and the principal Commandement is that of *Charity*; without which we may be Members of the *true Church*, but not true *Diſciples* of *Chriſt:* that is, we may be *ſound in Faith*, but very *bad Chriſtians*.

But there lies a Snake in the Graſs. For the *Gentleman* has dreſs'd up for us this fine Syſtem of *Unity* for no other End, than to explode the Belief of One *holy Catholick Church upon Earth*, and run down all Pretentions to it *amongſt Men*. Becauſe it is certain a Church cannot be *One* without *Unity:* and the *Unity* he has deſcribed is ſuch, as can only be

found in *Heaven*, where there are no *Diſputes*, and where all the Members of that happy Society are united in *perfect Love* and *Charity*. Whereas there is no Church upon Earth without Diſputes about particular Opinions; and it is morally impoſſible, that in ſo vaſt a Body as the *Catholick Church* is upon Earth, all her Members ſhould be united in *perfect Love* and *Charity*. Nay the Contrary is manifeſt from daily Experience.

Now that this was the *Gentleman's* main Drift in his Deſcription of the *Church's Unity* is plain from his Words *pag.* 202. where he tells us, 1. that the Article of *one holy Catholick Church was put but late into the Creed*. Which he could not ſay for any other End than to vilify and diſcredit the Authority of that Article. 2. That the next Article (as he calls it, tho he owns it may be call'd a Part of the former) viz. *The Communion of Saints*, muſt *be referr'd to Heaven, where only is the Communion of Saints*. And the Reaſon he gives for this is, becauſe in Heaven alone there is no Mixture of *Reprobates*, who (as he tells us) *are but in Appearance Members of the Church*.

From theſe two Principles he draws the following Concluſion. *Therefore the truly Catholick Church in Heaven is chiefly and principally meant by the* holy Catholick Church, *and the* Communion of Saints *in the Creed*. There (ſays he) *is the great Body of the Church. There are but few at a Time upon Earth; and of them we know not, which belong to that truly Catholick Church or not.* pag. 202. 203. But who then are the *few*, that are allow'd by him to belong to the *Catholick Church?* He tells us *pag.* 202. *they are only the* Elect, *who are not Viſible upon Earth.*

This is the *Gentleman's* Explanation of that Article of the *Creed*, which is concerning the *Catholick*

Church. But to detect as briefly as is possible the Falsehood and Venom of it, I shall content myself with Setting down two Consequences, which follow manifestly from it. The *first* is, that the *true Church of Christ upon Earth* has always been *invisible* to us: since the *Elect*, of whom alone he says it is composed, *are not visible upon Earth*, according to his own Words.

Whence it follows *2dly*, that it has always been impossible for any Man to apply himself to *the true Church* either for *Instruction*, or *Ordination*, or any of the *Sacraments*; which evacuates all *Episcopal* and *Pastoral* Authority. Because no Man can know, whether the *Bishops* or *Pastors*, to whom he would apply himself, be of the Number of the *Elect*: nor by Consequence, whether they be Members of the *true Church*. And is not this most curious Doctrine!

But the ancient Fathers never taught it. For they always understood the *Parable* proposed by *Christ* of the *Field*, wherein the *Wheat* and *Tares* grew, and were *to grow together till the Harvest*, Math. 13. ℣. 30. I say they always understood this Parable as a faithful Representation of the *present State* of the Church, wherein the *Good* and the *Wicked*, *Saints*, and *Sinners*, *Elect* and *Reprobate* live mix'd together, and will do so till the Day of Judgment. And therefore when the *Catholick Church* on Earth is call'd *the Communion of Saints*, the Meaning of it is not, that all the Members of it are *Saints*, but that she is the only Communion upon Earth, in which there are *Saints*.

But the *Gentleman* asks, *what Unity has that Church, wherein the Elect and Reprobate are mix'd together?* I answer, she has the *Unity of Faith*, the *Unity* of *Sacraments*, and the *Communion* of all her Members united under one *Head*. And this is absolutely necessary to constitute *one Church*. Tho this alone suf-

fices not to Salvation, but the Leading a good Life, being united in Charity, and keeping the Commandements is likewiſe required.

However ſince the *Gentleman* has already given us a Deſcription of ſuch a *perfect Unity*, as the Church on Earth can never be capable of; let us now See, what Sort of *Unity* he will allow her. It is all reduced to this one ſingle Point. viz. *That as all the Nations in the World, tho at War together, are one Kingdom to God, ſo all Chriſtian Churches upon Earth, tho not one of them ſhould communicate with the other, are one Church to Chriſt.* pag. 200. 201. This is the Subſtance of his Diſcourſe in the two Pages quoted; and this is all the *Unity* he allows as eſſential to the *Catholick Church* in her preſent imperfect State. The true meaning whereof is this. *viz.* that as *Chriſtians, Jews, Pagans*, and *Mahometans* make *one World*, ſo *Catholicks, Hereticks*, and *Schiſmaticks* (provided they be *Chriſtians*, for he makes no Difference between *Chriſtians* and *Catholicks*) make *one Church*. Or thus. *As all Nations in the World, tho at War together, are one Kingdom to God; ſo all Churches in the World, tho they be Hereticks or Schiſmaticks, tho they diſagree in all Things but the Belief of common Chriſtianity, and excommunicate and bite and devour one another, are that one Catholick Church upon Earth, which we profeſs in the Creed.* If this be not monſtrous Doctrine, I know not what is.

But what was it, that made the *Gentleman* give into this extravagant Notion of the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* upon Earth? He had two Reaſons for it to the beſt of my Conjecture. *Firſt*, becauſe he could not ſufficiently enlarge the Bounds of his own Church, but by incorporating it with the whole Riffraf of *Heretical Chriſtians* upon Earth in ſuch a Manner, as to make them all appear to be but one

Church, or *Myſtical Body* of *Chriſt*. And 2*dly*, becauſe he could not make his own Communion be a Part of the *Catholick Church* by any other Stratagem, than by making the Belief of *common Chriſtianity* ſufficient to render any upſtart *Heretical* or *Schiſmatical* Communion a Branch of that Church.

But the *Gentleman* objects *pag.* 203. that if the aforeſaid Article relating to the *Catholick Church* had been meant in our Senſe, it muſt have been worded, *the Roman Catholick Church*. And ſince it is only call'd the *Catholick Church*, he concludes, *it extends to all Chriſtian Churches, which make up the Catholick Church upon Earth in ſuch an Unity, as our faln State will bear.* Here then all *Heretick*s and *Schiſmatick*s whatſoever are by the *Gentleman's* comprehenſive Charity once more adopted Members of the *Catholick Church*, as being united together *as well as our fallen State will bear.* That is to ſay (according to the *Gentleman's* true Syſtem of *Church-Unity*) like Nations that are at War, and Cutting one anothers Throats as faſt as they can.

But the grand Difficulty is yet unanſwer'd; *viz.* why the Church is not call'd the *Roman Catholick Church* in the *Creed*? I hope the Reader will not take it ill, if I anſwer this frivolous Objection ſeriouſly. For if I did not, it might for ought I know be adopted into the Number of *Proteſtant unanſwerables*: and it deſerves it as well as many more that have been cry'd up for ſuch.

The Reaſon therefore, why the Word *Roman* is not inſerted into the Article concerning the *Church* is, becauſe nothing but the *eſſential Attributes* of the Church are mention'd in the *Creed*. Now tho *Catholick* and *Roman Catholick* be ſynonimous *de facto*, it is not eſſential to the *Catholick Church*, that her ſupreme *Head* and *Governour* ſhould have his Epiſco-

pal See fix'd at *Rome*. For, if St *Peter* had fix'd his Epiſcopal See immoveably at *Antioch*, then inſtead of *Roman*, she might have been call'd the *Antiochean Catholick Church*. So that the Word *Roman* expreſſes no *eſſential Attribute* of the Church: but only marks out the Place, where her *Viſible Head* with whom all are bound to communicate has his Epiſcopal Seat.

Of private Judgment.

PAges 204. 205. 206. 207. contain a Summary of every Thing the *Gentleman* has ſaid againſt Submitting our private Reaſon to *Church-Authority*. The Reader will find it fully anſwer'd [1. Part. §. 26. 33. 37. 51.] where he will ſee the Reaſons, why a Perſon throughly convinced that he has found the *true Church of Chriſt*, cannot act rationally but in ſubmitting his *private Reaſon* to her Deciſions in Things, which are above the Reach of his Underſtanding. This the *Gentleman* has taken a World of Pains to ridicule. He calls it *putting out our Eyes, extinguiſhing the Lamp of Reaſon*, and what not? As if a Man acted contrary to Reaſon in not thinking himſelf wiſer than the whole *Catholick Church*, and Paying a Submiſſion when Reaſon itſelf obliges him to it.

Thus has he ſet up the Standard of perpetual *Schiſm* and *Rebellion* againſt the Church of God, by Authorizing each Man's private Reaſon to controll her Deciſions and Ordonances, whenever he ſhall be vain enough to think her in the Wrong and himſelf in the Right. Nay he ſays poſitively *p.* 205. that to do otherwiſe *will condemn us at the laſt Day*. And do's not this ſubject the Church of God to the Caprice of every private Perſon? Do's it not pervert the whole Order of Eccleſiaſtical Government,

and render both *Faith* and *Diſcipline* precarious? Can ſuch Doctrine have any other Tendency than to eſtablish *Deiſm* and *Free-thinking* upon the Ruines of all *reveal'd Religion?* Truly if *Popery* cannot be attack'd but with ſuch pernicious Principles as theſe, an unprejudiced Reader muſt conclude whether he will or not, that it has Truth on it's Side.

But can any Doctrine have *Truth on it's Side*, that has *Reaſon againſt it?* No, it cannot. But it may have *Truth on it's Side*, tho it be *above Reaſon*: and he, who ſees no Difference betwixt a Thing being *againſt* and *above* Reaſon, is ignorant of the very Alphabet of *reveal'd* Religion. As for Example, I hope the *Gentleman* will not queſtion, but that the Myſtery of the *Bleſſed Trinity* has *Truth on it's Side*. Yet it is infinitly *above* the Comprehenſion of all human Reaſon. But has it then *Reaſon againſt it?* No ſurely. For *Reaſon* can never be *againſt Truth*. And hence it follows, that tho this Myſtery be *above Reaſon*, a Man muſt be void of Senſe and Reaſon not to ſubmit his *private Judgment* to a firm Belief of it. And this alone is a full Confutation of every Thing the *Gentleman* has ſaid to lampoon and ridicule our Submitting to the Deciſions of the *Catholick Church* in Things that are above our Reaſon. Nay I chalenge any Man, that either believes the *bleſſed Trinity*, or the *Incarnation and Death of Chriſt*, or the *Propagation of Original Sin*, or any other ſuch *incomprehenſible Myſtery*, to give a ſolid Anſwer to it.

What the *Gentl man* ſays *pag.* 205. is remarkable. *To refuſe* (ſays he) *the Aſſiſtance of a Church, becauſe she is not infallible, is depriving ourſelves of a Means, which God has appointed; and is the ſame Perverſneſs, as if we ſhould refuſe to conſult a Lawyer or Phyſician, becauſe it is poſſible he may err in his Judgment.*

How extremely tender and wary is this Expreſ-

ſion,

ſion *to refuſe the Aſſiſtance of a Church?* Surely the *Gentleman* had ſome Check of Conſcience upon him, when he wrote this Piece. For why would he not ſpeak out boldly? Why would he thus mince the Matter inſtead of Saying, *to refuſe to* HEAR THE CHURCH? I preſume the Reaſon was, becauſe it would have put the Reader in Mind of our Saviour's Saying, *if he do's not* HEAR THE CHURCH, *let him be unto thee as a Heathen and a Publican.* Math. 18. ℣. 17. Which imports nothing leſs, than that we are bound under Pain of eternal Damnation to hearken to the Voice of the Church, and learn the Truth of her: And this would have ſpoil'd his darling Maxim; that we *muſt truſt to private Judgment in every Thing without Exception.*

But let that be as it will: I ask the *Gentleman*, which of all the *fallible Churches* it is, to whoſe Aſſiſtance we muſt have Recourſe *as a Means which God has appointed?* The Reaſon of my Queſtion is, becauſe his Principles of *private Judgment* and *common Chriſtianity* make one Church as good as another as to the Buſineſs of Salvation, provided it be but a *Chriſtian Church.* However Since I cannot queſtion, but he gives the Preference to the *Church of England*, as being not only a Member, but Miniſter of it; ſuppoſe now I ſhould make Choice of this Church to have Recourſe to for *Aſſiſtance*, I ask how far I muſt truſt her? To be ſure, if his Principle of *private Judgment* be worth a Rush, I muſt truſt her no farther than my Eyes can ſee, or my Reaſon can underſtand; which is but a courſe Complement to his Church: for Ile truſt a *Porter* or *Cartman* as far as that comes to. And if we truſt her any farther, if we believe upon her *Authority* Things, we cannot *underſtand* or *comprehend* (which the *Gentleman* calls *implicit Faith*) then he tells us *pag.* 105. *That this is*

abandoning both Senſe and Reaſon which God gave us as a Guide, and therefore will require it of us. And this only is that, which will render us ſelf-condemn'd and bear Witneſs againſt us at the laſt Day. The true *English* whereof is, that whoever do's not follow his own *private Reaſon* preferably to the Judgment of the Church, will be damn'd for it. Moſt excellent Doctrine!

However to Juſtify this dreadful Sentence, having told us before, that *to refuſe the Aſſiſtance of a Church becauſe she is not infallible is the ſame as Refuſing to conſult a Lawyer or Phyſician becauſe it is poſſible he may err*, he continues thus. *But tho I allow their Skill to be better than mine in their ſeveral Profeſſions, yet we ſtill keep to ourſelves ſo much Uſe of our Reaſon that if it were Poiſon, the Phyſician were Going to give me, I would not take it: And there are Things ſo plain, that no Lawyer ſhall perſuade me. Much more ought we to be careful in our eternal Concerns, and not to give ourſelves up implicitly to any whatſoever. That if they ſhould direct us againſt the expreſs Commands in Scriptures, or the Dictates of Reaſon and common Morality, or bid us deny all our Senſes we muſt acquieſce without Examining.* pag. 205.

It is not to be doubted, but this Piece is to be underſtood with Relation to any Church upon Earth: ſo that the *true Church of Chriſt* (in whatever Communion it be) is comprehended in the Caution it contains; and we are here moſt pathetically exhorted to beware of Placing too great a Confidence in the *Wiſdom* even of that Church, which *Chriſt* has eſtabliſh'd to be our *Guide to Heaven*, to which he has promiſed his *perpetual Aſſiſtance*, and which St *Paul* calls *the Pillar and Ground of Truth.*

'Tis true indeed the *Gentleman* is ſo modeſt as to ſuppoſe her to be a *fallible Church*, to give ſome Co-

lour both to the Miſtruſt we ought to have of her, and to this ſly Inſinuation, *viz.* that she is capable of *Directing us againſt the moſt expreſs Commands in Scriptures, of teaching a Doctrine contrary to the Dictates of Reaſon and common Morality, and Bidding us to deny all our Senſes*; by which he means, *Obliging us not to uſe them according to the eſtabliſh'd Order of Providence.* And the Reſult of all is, that whenſoever our *private Reaſon* (which to be ſure is more clearſighted than the *Church of Chriſt*) has the Preſumption to tell us, that she is guilty of any of theſe *impious Abſurdities*, we are then bound under Pain of eternal Damnation not to give ourſelves up to her, but to follow our *private Judgment* in Oppoſition to her.

And will the *Gentleman* after this pretend to bring either a *Jew* or *Deiſt* over to the *Catholick Church*? If he do's, they need but read to him his own *Caſe ſtated*, where-ever he ſtands up in Defence of *private Judgment* againſt *Church-Authority*, and they will maintain their Ground in Spite of him, and run him down with his own Principles. For they will both tell him, that according to his own Rule they cannot in Conſcience embrace the *Catholick Faith*: becauſe their own *Reaſon*, which he ſays they are bound to follow under Pain of eternal Damnation, convinces them, that *his Church* and the *New Teſtament*, the Authority of both which they equally deſpiſe, teaches a Doctrine *contrary to all the Dictates of common Senſe and Reaſon*; As, that *the immortal God became a mortal Man, and died an ignominious Death*: and that *three are one.*

Nay the *Jew* will moreover tell him, that his Church *directs her Children againſt the expreſs Commands of God in holy Scriptures*, by Obliging them to keep the *Sunday* holy inſtead of *Saturday*, which is

the Day peremptorily commanded in *Scripture* to be kept holy: and I defy the *Gentleman* to give a satisfactory Answer to the *Jew's* Objection against this Point of *Discipline*, unless he first retracts all he has said to vilify the *Church's Authority*, and pulls down the *proud Idol* of *private Judgement*, he has set up against her. Whence it appears, that a Member of the *Church of England* can neither argue against *Popery* without Furnishing *Jews* and *Deists* with Arms against *Christianity*, nor argue solidly for *Christianity* against *Jews* and *Deists* but from the very Principles he ridicules, when *Popery* is the Question.

I cannot quit this Subject without taking Notice of the pretty Colouring the *Gentleman* gives to the Presumption of one Opposing his *private Reason* against the solemn Decisions of the *Catholick Church*. He compares it with the rational Conduct of a Man, that refuses to take the *Poison*, his *Physician* is going to give him. Which is both a charitable Insinuation, that the *Church of Rome* is this unskilful or wicked Physician, and a general Caution to all Men not to trust the *Church* too far; because she may give them *Poison* instead of *wholesome Food*. A most noble Character of the *Church of God!*

But, to retort his own Comparison upon him, suppose a Patient should have a strong Fancy, that the *Potion* his Physician is going to give him is *Poison*, and a thousand skilful experienced and conscientious Physicians should assure him, that it is not Poison but a most excellent Remedy, which will certainly cure him; would not such an obstinate and conceited Coxcomb be a Self-murderer, if he should die for Want of taking it?

Now this is a faithful Representation of the Case between the *Catholick Church*, and a single Person opposing his *private Judgement* against her solemn

Decisions. And this was the very Case in the Beginning of the pretended Reformation between the *Church of Rome* on the one Hand, and the *first Reformer* on the other. Only with this Difference, that instead of a Thousand, he had Millions against him. For all the World knows, that the Faith he opposed was then, and had been profess'd by whole Christendom for many Ages; that it had been attested by undoubted Miracles in all the converted Nations under the Sun, and water'd with the Blood of innumerable Martyrs. So that the whole Question between the *Church of Rome* and the *Reform'd Churches* may be reduced to this one single Point: *viz.* whether it be more probable, that *whole Christendom* had been under a continual Dotage for many Ages together, or that the *first Reformer* was in the Wrong? I think the Decision of this Question is obvious to common Sense: and the Consequence of it is, that the *Reform'd Churches* have no better Security for their eternal Salvation, than a Man has, who has the Odds of Millions to one against him. Because their Religion can be no better now than it was at first: and it had Millions to one against it at first; as both *Luther* and *Calvin* own'd, when they first set up for *Reformers*. Let the *Gentleman* Judge by this how good a Cause he is imbark'd in, and how safe the Bottom is, upon which he ventures his Souls Salvation.

He tells us *pag.* 207. *that Truth is never afraid: for the more it is canvass'd, the brighter it appears.* But I doubt whether this will hold even in all *natural Truths*. For I think it is pretty clear, that there is such a Thing as *Motion*. Yet *Zeno* canvass'd the Nature of it so long till it turn'd his Head, and he denied the very Possibility of it: which plainly shews the narrow Compass of Man's Understanding.

Now if this be ſo even in ſome *natural Truths*, it is impoſſible it ſhould be otherwiſe in *Myſteries*, which are moſt certainly above the Reach of our Underſtanding. Have not *Toland* and *Whiſton* canvaſs'd the *Trinity*, till they have canvaſs'd themſelves out of all Belief of it? And have not the *Arians* and *Socinians* alſo canvaſs'd the *Divinity of Chriſt*, till they have canvaſs'd themſelves into downright *Blaſphemy* againſt it? Yet I preſume theſe are very certain *Truths*: But they are Truths of ſuch a Nature, as are not to be attain'd to by the Canvaſſing of *human Reaſon*, but by an humble Submiſſion.

The *Gentleman* adds, *it is ſtrange to ſee thoſe, who pretend to ſuch an Aſſurance as is infallible, and yet ſeek to avoid the Light of Reaſon, as if afraid of being detected.* He might as well ſay, it is ſtrange that they, who have a *bright Sunſhine* to ſee by, ſhould not truſt to the deceitful Light of an *ignis fatuus*, as if *afraid of being detected*: which inſinuation is both groundleſs and malicious. For tho the *Catholick Church* be *infallible* under the Directions of the *Divine Spirit*, ſhe knows that a Man, who follows his own *private Judgment* in Matters of Religion, has a *Fool* for his Guide. Which makes her afraid not of the *Light*, but of the *Weakneſs* of *human Reaſon*: as Men are afraid to look at the Sun, not out of Miſtruſt of it's Brightneſs, but for Fear of Hurting their own Eyes by Gazing at it. Tho, to ſpeak properly, ſubmitting our *private Judgment* to an *Authority*, which God himſelf has appointed to be our *Guide*, is not *Avoiding*, but *Following the Light of Reaſon* in the Manner we are directed to do. And therefore *Faith* is always *rational*. Becauſe nothing can be more *rational*, than to follow a Guide of God's own Appointment; and to ſubmit our *private Reaſon*, when he requires it of us. [Vide 1. Part. §. 51.]

However the *Gentleman* will needs have it, that we *are afraid of being detected.* And why ſo? *Becauſe the Canon-law forbids Laicks to diſpute about Religion.* Ibid. But what is it we ſhould fear to be detected in? What Secrets would ſuch Diſputes diſcover, which cannot be made known otherwiſe? Has the *Gentleman* in his *Caſe ſtated*, where he was Maſter of the Field, diſcover'd any Secrets we knew not before? Surely he affects to be Myſterious, and drop ambiguous Words in Hopes the Ignorant will miſtake them for profound Senſe. For who will ſuſpect he ſhould not have Penetration enough to ſee, that a juſt Diffidence of the Incapacity of the *Laity* to manage controverſial Diſputes is a much better Reaſon for the Prohibition he Speaks of, than a Chimerical Fear of I know not what; and I dare ſay he knows not what he means himſelf? Unleſs he means that the common Laity may be more eaſily impoſed upon by *Miſrepreſentations*, *Forgery*, and *Slander* than our learned Clergy. He was certainly at a very great *Plunge*, when he was forced to pick up ſuch Stuff as this.

But let us ſee, if what follows be any Thing better. *If Reaſon could be heard, it would make it very obvious to you* (ſpeaking to his *Lordſhip*) *that in all the Points before mention'd the Certainty is on our Side, and the Doubt at leaſt on yours.* pag. 207. Moſt ſtoutly ſaid! Juſt ſo ſpoke *Martin Luther*, when he ſtood alone againſt Millions. *It is certain* (ſaid he) *I have my Doctrine from Heaven.* Tom. 2. Fol. 333. And he had the ſame Foundation to build his Certainty upon, as the *Gentleman* has: *viz.* his own *private Reaſon.* For all the viſible Authority upon earth was againſt him.

But what is it, that makes the *Gentleman* ſo very uppiſh, as to think it obvious to any, that the *Cer-*

tainty of Salvation is on his Side? *For Example* (ſays he) *none make a Doubt, but that we may lawfully pray to God, and not before an Image of him, or without the Worſhip or Invocation of any Saint join'd with him: and ſo of all the reſt. But on your Part, if what I have ſaid makes them not appear unlawful to your Lordſhip, yet they muſt remain at leaſt doubtful, till ſome ſtronger Evidence be produced for them, than has hitherto been given.*

This with the *Gentleman's* good Leave is Begging the Queſtion: for I can faithfully aſſure him, that all he has ſaid againſt any Article either of our *Faith* or *Diſcipline* is of ſo little Weight, that his *Lordſhips* Certainty of having the Truth on his Side is not in the leaſt diminiſh'd by it.

But (ſays he) *they muſt remain at leaſt doubtful, till ſome ſtronger Evidence be produced for them, than has hitherto been given.* If he means *ſome ſtronger Evidence*, than has been given in the *Caſe ſtated* of his own Cooking; I grant he has all the Reaſon in the World to complain, that the Evidence his *Lordſhip* has there produced for the *Doctrine* and *Diſcipline* of his Church, is not at all ſatisfactory. But I hope he has given him ſome better Satisfaction in the preſent Converſation. And if the *Gentleman* will not ſhut his Eyes, nor deſpiſe his Adverſary, becauſe he had him once in *Leading-ſtrings*, he may now find that *ſtronger Evidence*, for which he ſeems to be in Queſt.

Now as to the Example he produces to prove the Certainty of Salvation to be on his Side, viz. *that none can make a Doubt, but that we may lawfully pray to God, and not before an Image of him, or without the Worſhip or Invocation of any Saint join'd with him, and ſo of the reſt.* I anſwer, this is the third Repetition of the ſame Argument. Tho (as fond as the *Gentleman* appears to be of it) it ſerves only to cut the

the Throat of his own Church; as I have fully ſhew'd in my former Anſwers to it. But ſince he is reſolved to give an Air of Importance to it by the meer Dint of Repetition (For who will ſuſpect a *Doctor* in *Iſrael* ſhould be capable of repeating inſignificant Trifles) I muſt beg the Reader's Leave to trouble him alſo with a Repetition of my Anſwer to it.

Let us then ſee, whether the *Gentleman* has not by this Argument furniſh'd the *Diſſenters* with Stones to throw at him. For ſuppoſe a *Presbyterian* or *Fanatick* ſhould argue thus. *None can make a Doubt but that we may lawfully baptize without the Sign of the Croſs, or receive the Communion Sitting: or that it is lawful for us neither to uſe the Common Prayer Book, nor Surplices, nor Organs, nor conſecrate Churches, nor keep holy Days for Saints and Angels, and ſo of the reſt.* Suppoſe, I ſay, a *Diſſenter* ſhould argue in this Manner, muſt not the *Gentleman* (unleſs he will renounce his Argument againſt us) allow him to conclude from it, that *Preſbiterians* and *Fanaticks*, who abhor all the aforeſaid *Popiſh Ceremonies*, and think they have unanſwerable Reaſons againſt them, have the *Certainty of Salvation on their Side?* However I appeal to his own Judgment, whether he would not have a very ill Opinion of the Religion of any of his *Biſhops* or *Parſons*, who ſhould baptize without the *Sign of the Croſs*, or lay aſide the common *Prayer-book*, or abolish the aforeſaid *holy Days*, and ſo of the reſt? And why ſo? Let him give a Reaſon for it if he can, that will not likewiſe condemn the firſt *Engliſh Reformers*, and utterly ſpoil the *Certainty* he pretends to on Account, that his Church neither uſes *Images*, nor *prays before them*, nor *invokes the Saints*, and ſo of the Reſt.

Wherefore my direct Anſwer to the Example produced by the *Gentleman* is this, *viz.* that tho *it*

be lawful to Pray to God and not before an Image of him, or without the Worſhip or Invocation of any Saints join'd with him, yet it is always unlawful to ſet up the Standard of Rebellion againſt the Church. It is unlawful to diſobey *ſuperiour Powers*, when they command nothing that is contrary to the Law of God. For *they who reſiſt Powers reſiſt God, and acquire Damnation to themſelves*, if St *Paul* is to be believed. Finally 'tis unlawful to raiſe *Schiſms* for Things that are indifferent in themſelves, And to omit any publick Duty in Contempt of the Authority that commands it, is always a criminal Omiſſion. And theſe are the Crimes, with which the *firſt Reformers* ſtand charged before God: as likewiſe they, who walk in the Footſteps of ſuch rebellious Forefathers, and continue the *Schiſm* which they began upon the ſame frivolous and unjuſt Pretexts. Yet 'tis upon this rotten Foundation the *Certainty*, the *Gentleman* boaſts of, is built. Much Good may it do him.

I find nothing in the four laſt Pages of his *Caſe ſtated* but a Repetition of Repetitions relating to the *Supremacy* and *private Judgment*. It ſeems he had it not in his Power to take Leave of his *Lordſhip* without giving the *Pope* a Parting Blow, and Complementing once more his own dear *private Reaſon*. I hope however I have ſaid ſome Things, that may help to cure him of his Fondneſs of it.

THE CONTENTS of the second Part.

§. 1.

OF the Virtue and Efficacy of the Sacraments. Pag. 1

§. 2.

Of Beads. p. 10

§. 3.

Of Bleſſings and Conſecrations. p. 12

§. 4.

Of the Sign of the Croſs, holy Water, and Exorciſms. p. 18

§. 5.

Invocation of Saints. p. 21

§. 6.

St Paul *to the* Coloſſians 2. ℣. 18. 19. *miſrepreſented by the* Gentleman. p. 29

§. 7.

The Difference between a Mediator of Redemption, and a Mediator of Interceſſion. p. 39

§. 8.

St Auſtin *falſified.* p. 44

§. 9.

The ſcandalous Parallel between the heathen Worship, *and that of* Roman Catholicks confuted. p. 47

§. 10.

Of Dividing the Commandements. p. 54

§. 11.
The Confutation of the Parallel continued. p. 57
§. 12.
Of ſuppoſititious Saints. p. 71
§. 13.
Of Devotion to the Bleſſed Virgin. p. 75
§. 14.
The B. Virgin *not put upon the Level with* Chriſt. p. 79
§. 15.
The Index expurgatorius examined. p. 87
§. 16.
Of Reliques. p. 91
§. 17.
Of Images. p. 97
§. 18.
The Church of England guilty of Incoherency. p. 100
§. 19.
The Subject of Images reſumed. p. 103
§. 20.
Concerning Images of God. p. 107
§. 21.
Of Heathen Idols, and the golden Calf. p. 114
§. 22.
Of Tranſubſtantiation. p. 124
§. 23.
Tranſubſtantiation proved from the Words of the Inſtitution. p. 127
§. 24.
Neither Reaſon nor Religion obliges us to Judge always according to the Information of our Senſes. p. 137
§. 25.
Chriſt's Body and Blood are both really, and in a ſpiritual Manner preſent in the Sacrament. p. 144
§. 26.
Objections from the Fathers anſwer'd. p. 152

§. 27.
The Gentleman's *unseasonable Boasting.* p. 169
§. 28.
Some Animadversions upon Dr Colin's *History of Transubstantiation.* p. 172
§. 29.
The Antiquity of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. p. 179.
§. 30.
Transubstantiation not repugnant to the Principles of Philosophy. p. 183
§. 31.
Of implicit Faith. p. 188
§. 32.
No Danger of Idolatry from the Adoration of Christ the Sacrament. p. 190
§. 33.
Of School-distinctions. p. 194
§. 34.
Some Touches of the Gentleman's *Skill in Drollery and Slander.* p. 202
§. 35.
Transubstantiation as ancient as Christianity. p. 208
§. 36.
Of the Worship of the Cross, and Images of Christ. p. 216
§. 37.
Some Touches of prophane Burlesque. p. 223
§. 38.
Of Concomitancy, and Communion in one kind. p. 232
§. 39.
Lay-Communion in one or both kinds is a Point of Discipline only, and neither forbid, nor commanded by Christ. p. 240
§. 40.
The Decree of the Council of Constance *concerning Com-*

munion in one kind is not contrary to Christ's Institution, *nor the Faith of the primitive Church.* p. 248

§. 41.

Some ſophiſtical Remarks upon the 6th Chapter of Saint John *anſwer'd.* p. 257

§. 42.

Of Celibacy, or the ſingle Life of Prieſts. p. 264

§. 43.

Objections anſwer'd. p. 268

§. 44.

Other Objections anſwer'd. p. 275

§. 45.

Of Purgatory. p. 284

§. 46.

Of Tradition. p. 291

§. 47.

The ſubject of Purgatory reſumed. p. 295

§. 48.

Of Merits. p. 300

§. 49.

Objections anſwer'd p. 307

§. 50.

Praying for the Relief of the Dead has been the conſtant Practice of the Catholick Church. p. 318

§. 51.

Some Remarks upon the Gentleman's *Performance.* p. 323.

§. 52.

Of the Liturgy in Latin. p. 326

The Poſtſcript, *containing ſome Remarks upon the* Gentleman's *Concluſion in the former Converſation.* p. 335.

BRITISH MUSEUM